Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-245
Tuesday
22 December 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-245 *22 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Ponomarev Interviews Chervov on INF Treaty *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Dec]* 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial on INF Treaty *[20 Dec]* 3
Kashlev Discusses Progress of CSCE Talks *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 17 Dec]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Studio 9' Program Presents Roundtable on Summit *[Zorin, Arbatov, Falin]* 6
Laotian Letter to UN Protests Thai Hostility 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reagan Discusses Ratification With Senators 15
Soviet, U.S. Public Polled on Summit Results *[Prozhogin in PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 15
Despite Summit, Soviet Workers Refused Visas *[Repin in TRUD 16 Dec]* 16
Kornilov on 'Iron Curtain' Immigration Laws 17
Document Implicates Bush in Irangate 18
IZVESTIYA Views Hart's Re-Entry, Chances *[17 Dec]* 18
Report on U.S. Aid to DRA 'Bandits' Hit 19
Officials Comment on Spaceflight Cooperation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Dec]* 19
Envoy Briefs Canadians on INF Accord 20

China

Fishing Protocol Signed With PRC in Moscow 20
Impact of PRC Reforms on Interest Groups Viewed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 21
Bilateral Economic Cooperation Assessed *[Vasilyev]* 21
Experts Discuss Joint Industrial Venture 22
Beijing Musicians Received by Amity Society 22

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Meets With SRV's Nguyen Co Thach 22
Further on Chebrikov Visit to SRV 23
Arrives in Hanoi 23
Meets With Pham Hung, Others 23
Korolev Views ASEAN Stand on Nuclear Arms 23
ASEAN Efforts on Nonnuclear Zone Welcomed 24
Thai 'Provocations' Against Cambodia Noted 24
PRK Responds to Thai Troop Withdrawal *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 24

Near East & South Asia

Jordan's King Husayn Arrives for Moscow Visit 25
Met By Gromyko, Shevardnadze *[IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]* 25
Husayn, Gromyko Begin Talks *[Amman Television]* 25
Nuclear Arms, Mideast Discussed 26
Reiterates 'Unified' Stand *[Amman]* 26
Honored at Dinner 26

Husayn Dinner Speech *[Amman]* 26
Gromyko Reply to Husayn *[PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 29
Husayn Meets Gorbachev 31
USSR Envoy Sytenko Meets Libya's Jallud 31
Akhromeyev Confers With Indian Officials 31
Pakistan Runs Afghan Rebel's Training Centers 31
Pakistanis Said To Participate in Afghan Combat 31

East Europe

Warsaw Meeting of Pact Information Group 16 Dec 32
Honecker Gives Concluding Speech at SED Plenum *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 32
PZPR Resolution Fully Supports INF Treaty 32
TRYBUNA LUDU Editor on Referendum Results *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 32
Trade, Payment Protocol With Poland Signed *[PAP]* 34
Jakes Thanks Gorbachev for Congratulations *[PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 34
More on CPCZ Central Committee Plenary Meeting 35
Plenum Concludes 18 Dec 35
Jakes Closing Report *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 35
SFRY Deputy Premier Arrives for Talks *[TANJUG]* 39
Medvedev Receives Bulgarian Editor *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 39

West Europe

Agreement on INF Inspections in UK Registered 39
Manufacturing Firm Set Up With Spain 39
Talks With Switzerland on Chemical Weapons Ban 40
Briefs 40
Business Links With Finland 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

New Stamp Commemorates INF Treaty 41
Internal Affairs Minister on Emigration *[KOMOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 41
Refusnik Allowed To Emigrate After 16-Years *[AFP]* 41
Anti-KGB Demonstrators Jailed for 15 Days *[AFP]* 42
Ryzkhov Speaks at Alma-Ata Aktiv 18 Dec 42
More on Ryzhkov's Address 44
Ryzhkov Visits Tselinograd Oblast 45
Kiev Gorkom Holds Plenum 12 Dec *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 13 Dec]* 46
Georgian Central Committee Holds Plenum 46
AUCCTU Plenum Proceedings Reported *[TRUD 13 Dec]* 46
Lukyanov Speaks at Conference on Legal Issues 47
Armenian CP's 'Unprincipled' Approach Viewed *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 47
Procedure To Protest Dismissal, Redundancy *[TRUD 16 Dec]* 50
Correction to Zaykov Remarks on INF Treaty 51

Economic

Abalkin on Need for New Perception of Centralism *[EKONMICHESKAYA GAZETA Dec]* 51
Economist Advocates Factories Issue Shares 54
Baku on Pace of Reconstruction in Cooperatives 55

Scientific

More on 'Soyuz TM-4' Ground, Space Activities 55
News Conference Held 55
More on News Conference 56
Moscow TV Reports Launch 56

Craft Moves to Higher Orbit 57
Flight 'Proceeding Normally' 57
Cosmonaut Titov's Near Misses Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]* 58
Data Cited From 'Astron' Observatory 59
Warsaw Intercosmos 20th Anniversary Meeting 59
Nuclear Power Engineering Seminar Conducted 60

Ponomarev Interviews Chervov on INF Treaty
PM211421 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Dec 87 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Account of interview with Colonel General N. Chervov, chief of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Observer M. Ponomarev: "A Treaty Which Enhances the Level of Security;" the article is accompanied by three 5.5 inch by 2.5 inch photographs of "Soviet SS-20 (RSD-10) and SS-12 (OTR-22) missiles and a U.S. Pershing-2 missile to be dismantled under the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles"—first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Excerpts] During the official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States, Colonel General N. Chervov was in Washington as one of the experts of the Soviet delegation. He participated directly in the joint meetings of the Soviet and U.S. working groups of experts.

N.F. Chervov opened his account by saying that the most important aspect of the treaty signed in Washington is that it marks the beginning of the real elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons. This is the short answer to your question about the significance of this document. History has decreed that this elimination should begin with medium-range and also shorter-range missiles. Medium-range missiles represent a direct and very serious threat to the territory of the USSR and its allies.

The Washington treaty, N.F. Chervov went on, is the first agreement between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of nuclear weapons. The signing of this treaty is a confirmation of the feasibility of a nuclear-free world and of the realistic nature of the Soviet program for ridding the world of nuclear and other mass annihilation weapons by the end of the 20th century which was set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement. It is a confirmation of the vigor of the new political thinking and evidence of the fact that the Soviet Union is seeking to introduce it in the practice of international relations.

The treaty signed between the USSR and the United States accords with the aspirations of all peoples. It is international in character. The interests of both the USSR's allies in the Warsaw Pact and the U.S. NATO allies are interlinked in it. Furthermore, it concerns not only the 9 countries on whose territories medium- and shorter-range missiles are either already sited or were planned to be sited. It concerns all the countries of the world whose security has been enhanced as a result of the conclusion of the Washington treaty. It is of crucial importance—and Nikolay Fedorovich emphasizes his point both by his voice and a decisive gesture—that in concluding this treaty both sides have overcome a psychological barrier which has existed in the relations between our countries for a long time. I have a feeling that we will soon embark on more cardinal decisions in the elimination of nuclear weapons. The outline is already emerging of a Soviet-U.S. accord on the radical reduction of strategic offensive arms.

[passage citing INF Treaty details omitted]

"Nikolay Fedorovich," I put it to my interviewee, "most KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers sincerely welcomed the signing of the Washington treaty. But there are also those who cannot understand why more Soviet than U.S. missiles are being dismantled, people like I. Ivashev from Volgograd, for instance, who express concern in this context. Are their fears justified in any way?"

[Chervov] "It is true that we have agreed to a certain asymmetry, but we have done it consciously. There are at least two reasons for this. For one thing, in political terms someone had to take the first step in order to embark on real arms reductions. Therefore it was not expedient to put pure arithmetic first and foremost. The point is not an arithmetical balance but a balance of genuine interests. In military terms this balance of interests, the balance of security for our country and our allies was fully maintained.

"Maybe I am repeating myself," Nikolay Fedorovich continued, "but we military men have always spoken out loudly about the great danger posed by the U.S. medium-range systems deployed near the USSR border, and especially the Pershing-2 missiles, which have a flight time of only 10 minutes with our country's vitally important center within their range. The presence of these missiles gave rise in the West to the illusory hope of the possibility of achieving a victory in a limited nuclear war.

"The forward-based U.S. and NATO nuclear systems were being built up and used as an instrument of blackmail in the position of strength policy and in attempts to gain military superiority. Therefore it is important to understand that both from the political as well as the purely military viewpoint it is not just figures which are vitally important, although they have a major part to play. What matters most is the security interests. Our security has not suffered in any way as a result of the conclusion of the treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles. On the contrary, the United States will have to dismantle its Pershing and cruise missiles which will eliminate the additional real threat created by their deployment in Europe."

[Ponomarev] Does this mean that it can be claimed with certainty that the assymmentrical cuts in medium-range and shorter-range missiles do not detract from the defense capability of the USSR and our allies in the Warsaw Pact?

[Chervov] Absolutely. The defense capability of our country has not suffered, it is reliably ensured.

[Ponomarev] But why did the Soviet Union in concluding the treaty with the United States cease to take into account the British and French missiles and other NATO medium-range systems in general?

Nikolay Fedorovich gave the following answer to this question: The problem of the British and French missiles has not been removed. It does exist. But this is not the time to discuss the question of the British and French nuclear potentials. It will be necessary to attend to this after the solution of the question of 50% reductions in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms. What do you think will happen? The USSR and United States are implementing major cuts in their nuclear potentials, while Britain and France remain on the sidelines? It does not seem logical.

Then the conversation turned to the problem of verification and inspections in connection with the treaty signed in Washington. The verification envisaged by the treaty is very thorough and all-inclusive. This has never happened before, N.F. Chervov stressed. Both sides have a real chance to see how the treaty pledges are being met. Nothing can be hidden.

"Just look," Nikolay Fedorovich said. "The verification time-frame covers not only the 3 years within which all the missiles have to be destroyed, but a further 10 years after their elimination. The United States will be able to carry out around 400 inspections on the territory of the USSR and also of our allies—the GDR and CSSR. The Soviet Union will be able to carry out 240 inspections on U.S. territory and on the territory of the West European countries where medium-range weapons were stationed or where it was planned to station them—Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands."

[Ponomarev] Why does the United States have the right to carry out more inspections?

[Chervov] Because more missile destruction facilities are envisaged in the USSR. Each facility can be inspected.

I would like to say in particular, Nikolay Fedorovich said, that the experience acquired in elaborating the section of the treaty on inspections will come in useful when preparing the other Soviet-U.S. agreement—on strategic offensive arms reduction. When preparing the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, the Soviet side was guided by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's instruction that when it comes to real disarmament we are in favor of the toughest, strictest verification. We put forward proposals which were far tougher than those of the Americans. The U.S. side itself dropped a number of points which it had previously put forward and did not press for agreement on them.

The treaty and protocol on inspections envisage checking the situation as it stands at the moment of the signing of the treaty; confirming the actual elimination of missile operating bases and ancillary missile facilities. But that is not all. They envisage a large number of regular inspections and inspections on suspicion: 20 inspections per year in the first 3 years, 15 annually in the next 5 years, and 10 annually in the 5 years after that. A total of 185 inspections over 13 years.

There will also be inspections at the gates of manufacturing plants to ensure that missiles are not being produced, and at the missile elimination sites. In both cases on a permanent basis.

Each country will carry out the organization of inspections within a precisely defined period; in fact, some of them will take only a few hours. Therefore, careful, advance preparations are needed. The other side must not have the slightest cause for accusing the other side of avoiding verification. As for the officers who will have the job of inspecting the other side, they must be professionally trained and highly disciplined people who know what they are doing and are able to stand up for the interests of the Soviet state. [Chervov ends]

I asked Nikolay Fedorovich to say a few words about how the experts' work in Washington went. We worked, the interlocutor replied, under the direct leadership of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev. It was a big and difficult task. The main thing we did was to elaborate in accordance with the Soviet and U.S. leaders' guidelines instructions for our countries' delegations conducting the talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms in conditions of observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

"I will say frankly," Nikolay Fedorovich grinned, "I was amazed by the behavior of the U.S. side. Somehow or other we found points of contact on nearly all the issues, with one exception—the question of SDI, the placing of space weapons in near-earth orbits. Here the Americans rejected all compromises out of hand. We will do it, and that's that. I think I am right when I say that it is the first time U.S. officials have said that.

"But despite the tough attitude of the U.S. side we managed to solve a number of fundamental questions and maintain the objective linkage between strategic offensive arms reductions and the preservation of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed. The United States was also forced to agree to include sea-based cruise missiles in the reckoning and to their limitation as part of the strategic offensive arms, but not in the context of the agreed quota of 6,000 nuclear warheads which each side will keep when they reduce strategic offensive arms."

[Ponomarev] Nikolay Fedorovich, do you think the U.S. Senate will ratify the 8 December agreement?

[Chervov] I believe it will be ratified despite certain forces who oppose the treaty. There are pretty hopeful signs that enable one to draw this conclusion. It is also the view of representatives of the U.S. Administration,

Congress, and the Defense Department. At a dinner arranged by Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I sat next to Senator Warner and other representatives of Congress. Like Crowe himself, they assured us that the treaty would be ratified, although the possibility of amendments was not ruled out. Another important fact is that the U.S. allies are practically unanimous in their support for ratification.

But the fight for the treaty, involving the administration and the President himself, is yet to come. Reactionary forces, above all those who have close connections with the military-industrial complex, are against it because they see the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles as the precursor of future agreements on arms reductions."

I thanked N.F. Chervov for the thorough and substantive conversation and got him to promise to give yet another interview for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA soon—this time on he problem of the radical reduction of strategic offensive arms. "Let's see what happens," Nikolay Fedorovich smiled in reply.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial on INF Treaty

PM211109 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "On the Path to a Nuclear-Free World"]

[Text] The attention of the world's peoples in these December days has been attracted to a unique event in the history not only of Soviet-U.S. relations but also of international relations. The official visit to the United States by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the documents signed during this visit marked the turn which has appeared in the process of the demilitarization of international life.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President held all-embracing and thorough talks on the entire range of questions of Soviet-U.S. relations, including arms reduction, human rights and humanitarian questions, the settlement of regional conflicts, and bilateral affairs. Despite the confirmation of serious differences during the discussion of a whole series of important issues, the Soviet side steered a consistent line toward the quest for new approaches toward the settlement of conflict situations, firmly defending the right of all peoples to choose their own path of development without outside interference.

The main result of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington was the signing of the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their medium- and shorter-range missiles. This treaty, the 17 December CPSU Central Committee Politburo session noted, is historic inasmuch as for the first time it discusses the real destruction of two classes of nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States. The very strict verification measures envisaged by the treaty reliably ensure the monitoring of its fulfillment by both sides.

The majority of the world's countries reacted most positively to the results of the Washington meeting. The leaders of the allied socialist states fully supported and assessed highly the results of the talks in Washington. The Berlin meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries noted that a step of historic dimensions has been taken which is already exerting positive influence on the political climate of the planet, is enhancing states' mutual trust, and strengthening hope for the triumph of realism and reason in the present complex, contradictory, but interdependent world.

The participants in the Berlin meeting expressed their profound thanks to M.S. Gorbachev for the Soviet Union's consistent and vigorous efforts which have led to the first real results in nuclear disarmament and have become evidence of the new political thinking. The meeting of leaders of the fraternal states stressed with satisfaction that this was an expression of the common peace-loving course of the Warsaw Pact states and of the initiatives and actions of the socialist countries, which invariably advocate the reduction of the level of confrontation and the transition to mutually useful cooperation in world affairs.

The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles accords with the interests of all peoples and increases the level of security in Europe, Asia, and beyond. Its attainment was promoted by the actions of many states, including the nonaligned states, and of the antiwar movements and peace-loving forces of all continents.

It is also of considerable importance that considerable headway was achieved at the Washington talks on the problem of a radical reduction of the two sides' strategic offensive armaments while observing the ABM Treaty. The conclusion of a relevant treaty, and that is possible in the very near future, would be a radical advance in the matter of disarmament and the creation of a nuclear-free world. The accords which have been achieved also strengthen the preconditions for making headway on other salients leading to the curtailment of the arms race—primarily salients like the banning and elimination of chemical weapons, the halting of nuclear tests, and the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The allied socialist states, as was reaffirmed in Berlin, are prepared to keep to the limits of sufficiency necessary for defense and to resolve the problem of asymmetry and imbalances in individual types of weapons by reducing these weapons on the side which is in the lead.

The treaty signed in Washington is an important frontier in international development. This is still only the start of nuclear disarmament, the first step to a nuclear-free

world. Moving from this start will require further strenuous thinking work and honest efforts and the abandonment of some ideas of security which seem indisputable today and of everything which feeds the arms race. But when old views are broken there is inevitably an increase in resistance from those who link their political and material well-being with these views. Certain circles in the United States and other Western countries are already mobilizing to prevent changes for the better. Voices urging the U.S. leadership not to go far and to halt the disarmament process are being heard increasingly loudly. They are demanding that steps be taken urgently to "compensate" for the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles by moving new nuclear forces into Europe and into positions close to Europe [v Yevropu i k Yevrope] and by modernizing the nuclear and other armaments remaining there. Some people are even trying to claim that the talks in Washington have eliminated differences on an issue like SDI. On this pretext they are calling for the acceleration of this program. These are dangerous tendencies and must not be underestimated. These actions contradict the spirit of the treaty which has been signed. They could lead to a new spiral of the arms race.

The risk of a nuclear catastrophe has not yet been eliminated. It is still great. Through the fault of the bellicose imperialist circles the world situation remains complex and tense. These circles want, come what may,to break the military-strategic parity and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are doing everything necessary to ensure the security of the USSR and its friends and allies.

That is why it is essential to continue to increase vigilance and combat readiness, to strengthen discipline, to raise the troops' political and morale status to a new level, and to display tireless concern for the technical equipment of the Army and Navy and the improvement of control. The party is firmly counting on military cadres in resolving the tasks of consolidating the country's defense capability. Soviet people's confidence in our military might should be unshakable.

Kashlev Discusses Progress of CSCE Talks

AU171640 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 17 Dec 87 p 3

[Undated interview with Warren Zimmermann and Yuriy Kashlev, heads of the U.S. and USSR delegations to the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting, by DIE PRESSE reporter Burkhard Bischof: "The Summit Also Affects Vienna"; omitted passages contain Zimmermann's answers]

[Excerpts] DIE PRESSE: Could the results of last week's summit in Washington also affect the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: In general, the summit meeting—in particular the INF Treaty that was signed on this occasion—has an effect on the political climate in Europe, and thus also on the Vienna follow-up meeting. I am very glad that the joint communique on the summit also notes that the Vienna meeting has to be brought to a successful conclusion. This is practically a direct order to us.

Concerning the practical effects, the communique cited the Stockholm "Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe" by its full name. This is very important, because some countries at the CSCE negotiations on the second stage of the Stockholm Conference refuse to mention disarmament as part of the conference title. We want to keep the full name. Because if disarmament is no longer contained in the conference title, in the future this might lead to a total exclusion of the neutral and nonaligned countries from the disarmament process within the framework of the CSCE. Conventional disarmament and the preliminary Vienna talks on this topic are also mentioned in the communique; in this respect, too, the two leaders advocated an early conclusion. We are ready for this.

DIE PRESSE: What is your general assessment of the course of the Vienna conference? Has there been any progress recently? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: The course of the conference is not satisfying, but not tragically negative either. Recently there have been signs of movement with regard to the question of the human dimension and the mechanisms in this field. For this purpose we—together with the GDR, Romania, and Bulgaria—have presented a compromise proposal which also includes certain Western ideas. We are not satisfied with the fact that the West practically considers its proposal on the human dimension (WT-19) as an unshakable monument.

DIE PRESSE: In your opinion, what are the reasons for the fact that the Vienna CSCE negotiations have progressed so sluggishly recently? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: In some fields, in military questions, for instance, the attitude of the West is more realistic and reasonable than in others. The fact that work in Basket Three is progressing so slowly is simply due to partly totally unrealistic demands by some Western countries. What we have to find now is the golden mean; then work at the follow-up meeting can advance much more quickly.

DIE PRESSE: What about the talks on the questions of economy, science, and the environment contained in Basket Two? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: The texts that have been worked out to date are a bit weak and do not reflect the developments in Europe. We are in favor of as many follow-up conferences as possible in this area, in particular if we do not reach any concrete results in Vienna.

DIE PRESSE: One gets the impression that last week President Reagan and party chief Gorbachev had as many problems with regard to human rights questions as the Western and Eastern representatives at the Vienna follow-up meeting. How would it be it possible to achieve a breakthrough in this question? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: First of all, it would be important to stop speculating so much on this question. But we know that much pressure is being exerted with regard to this issue, in particular within the United States. However, all this speculation has prevented concrete progress here in Vienna.

DIE PRESSE: Which CSCE follow-up events that have to be decided in Vienna have priority for you? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: We would not be afraid if eight or more follow-up conferences were to be concluded here in Vienna. We are for the two follow-up conferences in the area of security and for three or four conferences on the questions of science, economy, and ecology contained in Basket Two. Finally, we can imagine three follow-up conferences on questions contained in Basket Three, including a conference on humanitarian cooperation in Moscow.

DIE PRESSE: What do you think will be the date of conclusion of the Vienna CSCE meeting? [passage omitted]

Kashlev: I pray that we will have finished by Easter 1988. Otherwise the whole thing will become useless.

'Studio 9' Program Presents Roundtable on Summit
OW190745 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0509 GMT 19 Dec 87

["Studio 9" Program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Soviet Television and Radio political observer, with Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of the NOVOSTI press agency]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, Comrades. It has long been observed that important historic events acquire, in the eyes of the public, their authentic and true scope when a certain time elapses, from a certain historical distance. The time has now past for operational reportage directly pertaining to what has been happening during these notable December days of the Soviet-U.S. summit. Now is the time for a more in-depth analysis of what has taken place and an assessment of the significance of this event.

To talk about this topic, we have invited into our studio people who have had the opportunity to observe the development of work of experts of the Soviet delegation from a close quarter—Academician Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the Board of the NOVOSTI press agency and doctor of historical sciences.

I would like to begin our talk, Valentin Mikhaylovich, with a question directed to you. What, in your opinion, is the most important aspect of what has taken place? No doubt there are many aspects, but from your point of view, what is the most important one?

[Falin] This question could be answered strictly from a political point of view. However, since for the whole period, that is before, during, and after the Washington summit, the whole world, irrespective of one's world view, political convictions, national specifics, have been observing the results, I would like to give you a human, if you would, answer.

What is the greatest contradiction of the 20th century? Apparently, this contradiction is to be found between that which must be and that which is forbidden. If we were to ponder the way man has lived in the 20th century, what he has done during this period, things that sane thought perhaps would have prevented him from doing, we would reach the conclusion that today man is continuing to do the impossible. He knows that this must not be done, but he nevertheless continues to do it. He knows that he must not make war, but he nevertheless continues to create new types of weapons and horde them. In this context, we usually talk about a reconversion of the economy, that is, about changing the emphasis of the economy from military to peaceful aims. This task is extraordinarily complex and difficult. However, what is even more difficult is to achieve reconversion of the way people think. To renounce the reliance on force and dogmas and to force man to admit that his happiness, future, and fate is to be found in peace is a difficult task.

I think the Washington summit, above all else, is significant because it proved that the force of reason can be stronger than the force of arms. Moreover, it defeated not just the obsolete weapons crying to be junked because they can no longer be used, only to be replaced by weapons more perfect, more up to date, more destructive. No. The forces of reason in Washington defeated the most contemporary weapons, those just off the design board, just released from the plant laboratory.

If the situation is to continue—and one would hope that the prerequisites have been established so that it should continue to develop is this way — then mankind can look toward the future with greater hope.

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich, I would like to ask you a somewhat personal question. When you were preparing for your Washington trip, you obviously prepared various material for it and thought about it. You had certain hopes and expectations about what would take place. In connection with this, would you tell us what things you thought about prior to Washington that were justified, and what things were not?

[Arbatov] Of course, there were things that were, generally, common to both sides. These are very important. The Washington summit helped, perhaps, to make us more aware of their greater significance. In particular, I have in mind the Treaty for the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

This was prepared. It was a condition for the summit. Naturally, no surprises could have been expected. Indeed, what everyone expected did in fact take place. I would add that the psychological effect of this, beginning with those who gathered in the hall where the treaty was signed (keep in mind that these people are by no means naive but are professional politicians, and many of them deep down are quite against this treaty) has surpassed my expectations. You see, many in that hall had to bow before the majesty of the step they had expected but which, nevertheless, when it actually took place, were ... [changes thought] For the first time, a large portion of perfected nuclear weapons is being eliminated. New paths are opening up. They were forced to bow their heads. One got the feeling that some of them lost their breath. That was the feeling.

As for other things, expectations are frequently in excess of reality. I would like to see, as would others, the talks move past the point they are presently at to the next agreement on reduction of strategic offensive weapons, provided the antimissile defense limitation treaty is retained. Progress has been made. One cannot say that

we should be dissatisfied with this, but, speaking candidly—perhaps here I am expressing the opinion of many but certainly all of us and even many on the American side—that no matter whether or not it could be expected, one hopes that further progress will be made. I think it turned out very well. After all, there was a struggle for the agenda. There were many who wanted to exclude the primary questions from the agenda and substitute important but not principle questions. Furthermore, even in dealing with these important questions, there was an attempt to distort the proportions and pick out... well, to go over to political speculation, as was the case with the human rights question, certain regional questions, and so forth. In this matter, I feel that on the whole, the unfolding of the events themselves dictated its own logic. The main thing that emerged was the main thing to start with, whether they [those in opposition to the agenda] liked it or not. The agenda was determined not only for the present but the future as well, despite all the counsel and invocations of those on the right—the extreme right—that this should be abandoned, that only one or two questions ought to be focused on, particularly those unpleasant or difficult for the Soviet Union.

Candidly, although I was prepared for the great changes in awareness and attitudes—this of course is due to the psychological environment and the general attitude of the public—that are taking place in America, what did take place surpassed all expectations.

Obviously the visit made a great impression on the Americans. This is already being discussed. There is a profession in America called television consultant. Television is serious political business there. No party nor political organization would dispense with the services of a highly-paid television consultant. In this context, we are but rank amateurs, those of us other than you, of course, Valentin Sergeyevich. One of them, a Michael Kay, a television consultant for the Democratic Party, explaining the success, said with a touch of horror that Americans are used to the fact that their political leaders are constantly seen on television. If they can create an attractive image and the ability to manipulate the audience, then they are attractive to the Americans. He then went on to say that he was frightened: What would happen if our enemies became as skillful as we are? However, I think that the cleverest thing about this was said by the television consultant to the Republican Party, a certain (Deardorf).He said that while in America, Gorbachev profited from the most valuable political asset there is: excellent timing of his ideas with the demands of the moment. This American observer said that the Soviet leader is a man with an excellent contemporary political platform, at a time when in the United States the desire to abandon military competition to put the nation's economic house in order has become widespread.

Continuing the topic Valentin Mikhaylovich began, this is what I feel is most important. If we approach what has taken place as an event, we could talk about the treaty, the kind of foundation that has been laid for the next talks, and so forth. Or we could approach it not as an event but as a landmark, a significant landmark in the political process. This was prepared by the certain unfolding of events and will influence the future development of the process.

This seems to me to be very important because this is precisely what is occuring, a change in the agenda. If previously it was the cold war, the struggle against the evil empire—the evil empire versus the good empire—and so forth, that was being viewed—well, we too had our own ideas, such as a division of the world into two systems, with all the ensuing consequences—now there is a growing... [changes thought] As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has repeatedly mentioned, including at the press conference, that in this sphere even the public at large, the people are ahead of the politicians. There is a growing understanding that our previous status is becoming immaterial, that the previous threats are somehow poised in midair. We cannot have war. The entire situation when weapons are manufactured in fantastic numbers ...[changes thought] Just 5% of the stockpiled nuclear weapons would be sufficient to destroy mankind. Nevertheless, the arms race continues.

For 40 years we have been living in a state of 5-minute readiness for this global destruction, with the added great risk that some mechanism, or whatever, can fail. This is gradually getting through to people, and another thing is getting through: The agenda is changing; there are other threats. It is not simply a matter of whether one wants a better situation and eliminates this threat. The problem is that previous attitudes do not let you focus on present threats.

The ecological threat can just as dependably destroy mankind as nuclear weapons, if we continue to act as irresponsibly as everyone is presently around the world, only not in a matter of minutes but in a number of decades or a hundred years. There is also the economic threat. It is hard to imagine, you know, that 15 to 18 million people die of hunger every year in the world. In other words, in 3 years as many people die in the world as there were deaths as a result of World War II. For example our program will last an hour, and during this time 1,500 people will die of hunger.

Now this creates political tension. Every 10 years the rift between the richest and poorest nations doubles. Is security possible under these conditions? The entire economic disorder of the world is now being felt by the highly-developed countries as well as the underdeveloped ones. There is also an increase in internal problems in all countries, both large and small. This a characteristic feature of the day. Everybody is up to his ears in his own problems.

Now under these conditions the military competition that is occuring, the enormous battles of the dinosaurs, imaginary or those being prepared for, are a distraction that does not permit the real problems to be grappled with.

Now people are beginning to understand this. It is most timely. I think that a great merit of our policy, our recent policy, lies in the fact that these aspirations of people—unconscious aspirations occasionally discussed by great thinkers—have in the past 2-3 years become a foreign policy platform of a great power. It was noted in Paris during Comrade Gorbachev's autumn visit in 1985 that we pledge to bring our ideas in line with the new realities of the world, including in the foreign policy and military spheres. What was promised was done, and this greatly altered the entire world situation.

In this regard, I think the Washington summit did not signify a fundamental change in Soviet-American relations but was a very important stage, showing that the old ways of thinking and the old policies are no longer valid.

[Zorin] Now Georgiy Arkadyevich, you spoke about the enormous impression made by both the results of the meeting and by the Soviet leader. In the days after the meeting, an unpleasant fact has surfaced, to put it plainly. Apparently this summit was not to everybody's liking, and a campaign has begun and is under way aimed at denigrating both the significance of what has occured in Washington and the impression made on the people by these events. In particular, the following theses are being launched: After all, what is so unusual about the INF Treaty? It destroys only 4% of the nuclear arsenal, while 96% remains. What is so unusual about the results of the Washington summit if not a single significant agreement, not counting the INF Treaty which was coordinated before the meeting, was signed there? This, supposedly, is all exaggerated and is all propaganda—to a great extent, anyway. This opinion, pursued by certain right-wing circles and some press organs, can be heard.

Valentin Mikhaylovich, I would like you to give us your opinion on this matter.

[Falin] In the sea of responses, like in the real sea, there are all kinds of currents, surface and deep, warm and cold. Obviously, even before the summit in Washington, it could be predicted that depending on the outcome of the meeting, whether or not it will be possible to reach agreement, another demarcation of supporters and opponents to normalization and improvement of international relations—both between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and between the East and the West and the North and the South, as they say—would take place.

I think the wrong criterion is being used in making assessments, and I think it is being used purposely by many critics who are trying to belittle the significance of what has occurred at all costs to ensure that what has happened does not become a model, a standard for everything that follows, an indicator of the possibilities for rational and sensible use of the chances presented by history to move forward to achieve a truly stable world where every nation, people, and country can feel like an equal with a guaranteed security that is also equal.

It is incorrect that as a result of the meeting only that which was achieved on the eve of the meeting was elucidated. It is incorrect if only because literally a day before the meeting, very intense talks were continuing in Geneva between the delegations. It was still not possible to say at these talks, 24 hours before the arrival of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the delegation in Washington, whether or not the meeting would be held. These talks were carried on not only in Geneva but directly between the leaders of the two countries as well. Only as a result of joint efforts were conditions eventually established for realizing agreement on the meeting itself. The assertion of unfair critics that in the course of the Washington meeting only some kind of order was put into previously achieved agreements is also incorrect, insofar as during the meeting, particularly as far as future talks or continuing talks on strategic arms, on observing the ABM Treaty, and other issues, are concerned. Agreement, consent, and understanding were achieved at the very last minute.

People were already gathered on the White House Lawn for the general secretary's farewell ceremony, while Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Reagan were engaged in working out the final formulas that made up the essence of the agreement. Without these final—not pen strokes but corner stones that were laid into the concluding joint summit statement—agreements in the form that we now know as a result, the Washington meeting would also not have taken place.

Now if this was the case—and it was the case and not otherwise, whether the critics want it or not—then this means it was not simply a meeting to pay respects to one another—although such meetings are in themselves worthwhile—but it was primarily a businesslike and intensive meeting at which problems were solved on which without exaggeration, the future of civilization depends.

[Arbatov] In connection with this, this is what I would like to say. You know the press cited a statement made by Kissinger a few days ago. He may have had his own reasons, or most likely he did have some design when he made it, but anyway, he said that President Reagan apparently, in order not to further antagonize his right-wing critics, even concealed the true scope of the agreement reached at the meeting.

I am confident there was no intentional plan of this sort. Just think: The two powers had actually already agreed, in the form of an obligation, to conclude a treaty [recognizing] that they, as the minimum, had two times more nuclear weapons than was necessary. This is a terribly important understanding, from which of course it is not known what further conclusions will be drawn.

However, very radical conclusions suggest themselves, and not only in the area of the agreement, but in the area of the relationship to militarism and to military force as a whole.

I think that what frightened...[changes thought] it was precisely the realization of this that most of all frightened those from whom these negative statements that you spoke about and the desire to belittle the meeting are coming from. Valentin Mikhaylovich probably remembers what an amazing situation it was. On the 9 December, on the eve of the meeting's conclusion, suddenly that evening, the entire tone of the television programs changed completely.

[Falin, interrupts] On the evening of 9 December, to be more precise.

[Arbatov] From the time of the evening broadcasts, from about 11 pm, everything completely changed. What did everything come to? There is no need for excessive expectations; there are difficulties of this and that kind. The next day, I told an American journalist I had had an impression of a well-rehearsed campaign. He said: What do you mean by well-rehearsed? There was simply a briefing. Howard Baker, White House chief of staff, spoke there, and he gave an order to this effect. The American press, apparently, turns out to be very obedient. It happened that on the next morning after the reception at the Soviet Embassy, I had a conversation with Bush, and Bush told me: You know, the thing I am most afraid of is excessive expectations. I answered that I was not much concerned about this, although excessive expectations of any kind are bad in principle. What concerned me most is the intentional skepticism and intentional cynicism about the meeting, and the desire to underestimate its significance. This is exactly the thing which expresses the fear, and not only the fear of the ultraright. You know, I am not the most concerned about the ultraright. The ultraright is a specific group of people that has always been somewhere on the brink of American political life and acquired respectability only with the coming of President Reagan. The popular President made this crowd respectable. They feel uncomfortable, they shout, they demand, and in particular, they demand that the Moscow meeting and the treaty ratification be rejected.

But the traditional, respectable center of the American foreign policy establishment has also become concerned. There are different people in this group. There are those who consciously do not want this development and those who are afraid of it because they have noticed that some foundation stones of the whole cold war policy, as it formed after World War II, have started wavering and shaking.

These things are frightening, and these things are very significant. These things did not happen in Washington during these 3 days. They were in preparation for a long time and did not end with Washington. However, Washington is a great landmark in this respect, a turning point, a very big step on the path of restructuring international relations: the demilitarization and rational construction of international relations, the time for which was more than due. Of course, this will take all realities, contradictions, difficulties, and differences between us and the Americans, and socialism and capitalism, and so forth, into consideration.

[Zorin] You spoke about increasing pessimism. It happened. On the other hand, you have had an opportunity to closely observe everything. This is why I want to ask you not about the calculated political pessimism, but about those actual difficulties that you happened to observe in the course of discussions and talks during the Washington meeting.

[Arbatov] If one looks at the period of the beginning of improvement of Soviet-American relations from the point of view of history—and history has already had such periods—one can see it occurred against a background of almost unprecedented anticommunist passions and attitudes that raged for several years. This undoubtedly created difficulties. One can say, it was reflected in many Americans, the major participants in the Washington meeting, and created some ambivalence. On the one hand, there was an understanding of the need for an agreement—I am not speaking about opponents, but about proponents of the agreement. On the other hand, there was the whole burden of anti-Soviet and anticommunist superstitions and passions that had been raging for a long period. It was not always easy to reconcile these tendencies. Besides, an enormous momentum of military preparations, certain policies, and so forth, was gathered over recent years, and all these things also created difficulties. Finally, there was the usual American difficulty caused by the fact that internal political considerations always play a very large role and become an obstacle to the adoption of even serious political decisions.

In particular, the behavior of a large number of people in the Senate in connection with the forthcoming U.S. elections is a usual story for the United States. We know this. These things happen quite often, and they have been reported widely. It is a kind of a game. It is a game for small stakes, but these are the laws of American politics: A politician who strives for something usually puts his own interests—to reach and occupy a desired position—above even important national interests. These difficulties did not become unmanageable, but they, of course showed their influence, and they are probably not the only ones. There are some others—the great inertia, for example. You see, politicians, especially, have this... [changes thought] Here indeed, the attitude of people—of the public, the broad public—turned out to be ahead of the professional politicians.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, what are your impressions?

[Falin] I think the main difficulty here lies in the deep contradiction between the United States' verbal declarations and its practical deeds. There is a Latin proverb, a Latin saying: If your feelings are insincere, then all your reasoning will be false. If your intentions are insincere, then your deeds will be false, too.

Now readiness to renounce the reliance on nuclear war is proclaimed, insofar as there can be no victor in a nuclear war. Now readiness not to strive for military superiority is proclaimed. Yet at the same time the need for the U.S. policy to continue from a position of strength and its intention to pursue such policies are spoken about. The one thing excludes the other. If you carry out policy from a position of strength, then someone should be weaker than you are, and if someone does not want to be weaker than you are—and, naturally, he does not have to be—then there will be an arms race. Someone will win or lose this arms race.

Political unwillingness, unreadiness, or inability to reduce all things to a common denominator and to, correspondingly, reconsider one's political doctrines and one's policies as such, in accordance with the demands of the time, appears to me to be the main difficulty at the present time. One can formulate this idea in another way. Disarmament, in particular total nuclear disarmament, has frequently and for many years been regarded as utopian. Today, it is increasingly recognized that it is utopian to think that it is possible to live under conditions of the arms race—particularly the nuclear arms race. If in the past it was said, particularly by philosophers and idealists: I think, therefore, I am, then today these same philosophers would have to say: I am because I think. Mankind is immortal only while reason is infinite, and reason reminds mankind every day, hour, and minute that it is not immortal.

[Zorin] In the United States—it became obvious only after the summit meeting—critical remarks are being directed at President Reagan because supposedly he made too many concessions to the Russians. We shall speak openly: Certain apprehension is being expressed in our country as well. Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke about this in his press conference. In particular, the people are concerned about the fact that under the INF Treaty our country destroys more warheads than the United States does. I think this question warrants an answer.

[Falin] Naturally, an answer should be given, and the answer should be clear. What is President Reagan being criticized for? If one observes the situation directly, while staying in the United States, the main argument of the opponents of the events that took place at the Washington summit meeting is the following: The President recognized the Soviet Union as a feasible and even desirable partner. The President abandoned the concept of the Soviet Union as an evil empire, and the United States sees the Soviet Union as a partner which can and should be trusted.

The conclusion, consequently, is reached: The President did not achieve what the ultraconservative circles of the United States had hoped for, and the President, in their eyes, has shown weakness. That is what they say: This weak President is a man who all but engages in pro-communist propaganda. What is the pro-communist propaganda they see in President Reagan's words? It must be in the fact that he, at least in principle, regards as conceivable a dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the West and East, of a kind other than sabre-rattling.

They see it in the fact that he allows the possibility of benefit from or even necessity for an agreement that would limit, confine, and in the final analysis, reduce the costs of the arms race which today lies as a heavy burden on the shoulders of all peoples. This is in fact what I have been saying. If the President did not take the first big step, then he did take half a step toward recognizing the fact that there is a reasonable alternative to the policy of force. This is what makes them sit up and pay attention. This is what frightens them, for this calls for renunciation of the policy of force. What does this mean? In effect it means to renounce, or at least to reexamine, and deeply at that, the whole American philosophy of life, the American way of life. Within America itself, all is built on the cult of power. The strong oppress the weak; the strong rise at the expense of the weak; the strong find success at the expense of the weak.

Therefore, it becomes quite logical that this belief in power from within America is transferred into its foreign policy. For many years, the United States could not imagine anything else because its power, its enormous superiority—military, economic, financial, and so forth—gave the United States much profit, brought in very great dividends. However, the world is now changing. In the contemporary world, the United States cannot count on achieving its main goal: to ensure its fundamental national interest while following the present course, because this fundamental national interest consists of securing peaceful conditions for the existence of United States. The prerequisite for this is that the United States, and with it all the other states, would live, exist, and continue into the future.

[Zorin] As for the second part of my question, Georgiy Arkadyevich, about our doubts?

[Arbatov] You see, this is quite understandable. The history of the Soviet people itself has taught us to be very vigilant and sensitive to all questions pertaining to security. However, I would not even speak at great length about, well, if we are striving for zero, or equality, yet it results that we are reducing more, then we had more to reduce. This is part of the asymmetry we said should be removed asymmetrically. In this instance we set an example, and this is good. This is far from the crux of the matter. There are other main factors. Marshall Akhromeyev in his recent interview with PRAVDA said that we also are dealing with another form of asymmetry, not

merely the number of warheads but also what they are aimed at. The warheads on the U.S. missiles could reach Soviet territory. Our warheads, on intermediate-range and particularly on the short-range missiles, could not reach America. Moreover, the American missiles could reach us in 8 minutes.

There is a very serious mistake here which originated, and quite successfully at that, in Western propaganda, which depicted the deployment of intermediate-range U.S. missiles in Europe as a response to the Soviet Union deployment of RS-10 or, as the NATO jargon calls them, SS-20, in Europe. In reality, these had nothing in common with one another. They planned to deploy these missiles independently of our missiles. This was part of the American strategy which in English is called extended deterrence, and which was confirmed as far back as President Carter's time, in Presidential Directive No 59.

Two different understandings developed. The public was being convinced, and the public of America and West Europe understood that the American missiles were a response to the Soviet SS-20 missiles. The politicians thought quite differently. General Rogers spoke candidly that the Pershing-2 and the cruise missiles were not a response to the SS-20 missiles. They form a part of the American nuclear first-strike strategy. The first resort to nuclear weapons in case of conflict in Europe is part of the limited war in Europe concept. However, they could not speak of this openly. Perle was the author of the "zero option." He proposed this to the President, being absolutely certain that we would not agree to this. When we accepted the "zero" proposal, and then later even went somewhat further, then this brought them to a state of confusion. But by then the situation was such that, and here I will quote a famous specialist in this field, British Professor Sir Michael Howard of Oxford University: It has now became politically impossible for Western leaders not to accept the Soviet proposal.

[Arbatov] Although from the military point of view a whole rung drops out of this escalation ladder which was built according to the old war recipes. The whole situation was becoming quite impossible. Manfred Woerner, in his time, made a bet. He was until very recently, a minister, the former defense minister...

[Falin, interrupting] He is still a minister.

[Arbatov] Yes, but he has now received an appointment. He will become the NATO Secretary General. He made a promise that if all intermediate-range missiles in Europe are destroyed, he will crawl 240 miles on all fours. That is nearly 400 kilometers. When the missiles are destroyed in 3 years I will be asking for special leave to see him crawling from Brussels, say to somewhere on the GDR-Polish border. [laughter]

[Zorin] Colleagues, I wish to pose a somewhat awkward question. The question could prove to be awkward for both you and me, but I wish the talk to be candid. Valentin Mikhaylovich, you have been saying that regarding criticism of Reagan that he took several steps in the right direction. During past years we have criticized President Reagan a great deal. We will admit that we have criticized him here, in our studio as well—even with this same group. What has happened? Has Reagan changed?

[Falin] Unquestionably, Reagan has changed. He did not waste seven years, and if Reagan had begun his presidency with some of the statements he made on the eve of the Washington summit, then I rather think that the world, and U.S.-Soviet relations would be different today. In fact, they would be in much better condition than they are today.

To speak only about changes in Reagan's positions, however, or even about changes in Reagan himself is only to tell half the truth. Certainly, during these 7 years we, too, have changed. In fact, we definitely changed. I would not be exaggerating, although I am expressing only my own point of view, if I were to say that 7 years ago the present treaty would not have been acceptable to our leadership, either. The notions of today and those of 7 years ago are different. Today we objectively know more about the ramifications of certain steps.....

[Arbatov, interrupting] Not to mention the method of thinking. The old and the new thinking.

[Falin] Yes, the method of thinking became quite different. A new form of thinking is not a mere banner; it is not some future goal; it has already become the practice of our policies, the practice in our lives, and it is finding specific expression in the embodiment of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral actions with the participation of our state. It follows then that we are witness to deep changes, to extraordinarily important changes which, are undoubtedly opening up a new stage, and perhaps even a new epoch in the development of civilization. [Arbatov] I think that the matter here also lies in—well, speaking honestly, certainly we all ought to be thinking and changing. I cannot remember an instance when I felt repentant about criticizing Reagan undeservedly, although all of us should be thinking that when we are speaking or writing about the other side, we should be at the level of the new thinking. Nor should we try to pick at every little thing. I am not speaking about lies. This seldom happened or was tolerated in the past. But the selection of facts and stresses, they must certainly be correct. Regarding Reagan, here there are exceptions. Even today I still think that Reagan appeared as the representative of extreme right-wing circles—the American ruling elite. This is how he appeared and by the way, we spoke about this in one of the Studio 9 programs to the chagrin of some letter-writers and even some comrades who expressed their displeasure. You remember

that, Valentin Sergeyevich—when it was said that Reagan has taken the militarization of policies to such an extent that in wishing to frighten us, he succeeded primarily in frightening his own people and his allies? This led to the unprecedented demonstrations, to the rise of the huge antiwar movement that forced him to begin to change. This exposed the contradictions even more. It all started here. The physicians and scientists movement, all this enlightened the people. These years were the years of very considerable enlightenment of people in relation to the threat of nuclear weapons and nuclear war.

That was the first point. Nowt he second point. You know, this whole question reminds me of what happened with Nixon. Did Nixon change? Do you remember? Nixon, in his time an anti-Soviet, one of the McCarthyists. It was with him that detente began.

Political situations change. In part, this is what Valentin Mikhaylovich spoke about. We, too, are participating parties. We are not merely an audience or observers. Or judges of things that are happening in the world. We are actively participating parties. But that is not all: The whole world is changing. Political conditions have changed to such a degree that the political leader who was constantly seeking political successes in America at the end of the seventies and the beginning of the eighties staked his fortune on anti-Soviet and military cards. Now, however, he is seeking opportunities for political success in a summit meeting with the Soviet leadership, in the signing of treaties for the reduction of arms and so forth. I think that this is a very good and healthy change.

[Zorin] Yes. Here we must keep in mind—and I think that this should be mentioned—the timing of the Washington summit. The election campaign has begun in earnest. The struggle for the White House. In America—Georgiy Arkadyevich, you have already spoken about this today—much is determined by this struggle. Reagan is a sufficiently experienced politician to feel the definite change in the attitude of the public, millions of voters. I think that these factors play an important part. Reagan himself is not running in the fall of next year—the Constitution prevents him from doing so. But he would find it exceptionally unpleasant—in fact it would amount to a political disaster—if the party headed by him suffered defeat in these elections. Sensing the change in attitude, he apparently makes changes in his policies. Certainly, the matter is not all that simple. Take for example the fact that out of the six presidential candidates from the Republican Party, four are against the agreement, Dole is vacillating, and only one, Vice President Bush, supports President Reagan's line. This also attests to the complexity...

[Arbatov, interrupts] Nevertheless, chances for ratification are quite healthy. They do exist.

[Zorin] Yes. Apparently, one can draw the conclusion that perhaps the leadership of the Republican Party is more accurate in determining the political temperature of the country.

Now I would like to ask you, Valentin Mikhaylovich, a question that has a direct bearing on the problems that we have been discussing. A not insignificant factor, and one affecting the possible further progress of events, is the reaction in Western Europe to what has happened. The reaction there, as well as among the leading politicians, is by no means simple. What would you say in this regard?

[Falin] Indeed, the reaction has been quite varied. If one was to speak about the British leadership and the government of the FRG during the final stages, they have facilitated the achievement of the INF Treaty. There are a number of other countries—France in particular should be mentioned—whose attitude towards the treaty and to the various understandings reached in Washington remains quite cool. It is no secret that during consultations within the NATO framework, the French insisted that under no circumstances should the title "historic" be applied to that which was achieved in Washington; the results could understandably be noted positively, but are in no way historic.

I think that much is hidden behind this episode. In particular, the aspiration even today of definite forces and circles to build hurdles, to hinder movement in the direction which, well, which was in essence programmed in Washington. Let us ask ourselves a question: All the states in the world accept the principle of sufficiency in military matters. What does this mean? This means that literally on the following day, 95 or 90% of nuclear weapons are absolutely superfluous. Apparently, it can be said that three quarters—give or take a bit—of conventional arms have also become unnecessary. Chemical and all other weapons become unnecessary. This is what it means to adopt the principle of sufficiency.

[Arbatov, interrupts] Sufficient for defense—for defense within the framework of this doctrine. To have sufficient forces for defense, but not enough for offense, for sudden attack.....

[Falin] Now then, what ideas are nurtured by many of the NATO leaders? Aha! The nuclear arms of United States and the Soviet Union are reduced by the notorious 4%, which apparently does not mean much, so this 4% must be compensated for by means of escalating the arms race in the conventional field and by means of perfecting those nuclear weapons which remain. Add to this the growth of nuclear arms in the United Kingdom and France.

Here essentially you have two different kinds of thinking, and if one speaks about NATO—and unfortunately here we have to speak about a number of European

countries—then to be retarded does not simply mean to lack one move, as in chess, but it means to be retarded in thinking by an entire epoch. The popular beliefs in force that make themselves felt here at every step will bring us many problems in the future, insofar as Washington—and we should note this precisely—is not just talk or negotiations about nuclear weapons, it includes talks about chemical arms, talks about conventional arms, and...

[Arbatov, interrupts] The question of conventional arms has never been raised as seriously as it was in Washington during our dialogue with the Americans.

[Falin] Therefore here I want to repeat the word: program—a program for a constructive movement forward towards a greater, better, and universal security was delineated in Washington, even if only in outline—and perhaps more than just in outline.

[Zorin] Thank you. I would like to conclude our talk today with a question to you both. It turned out that both of you took a direct part in the Geneva meeting, then you attended Reykjavik, and now, during these historic days you were in Washington. Consequently, you can judge the dynamics of the process that is taking place and the difficulties this process is meeting. Everything took place before your eyes. What is your forecast for the future course of events, particularly in Soviet-U.S. relations? Let us begin with you, Valentin Mikhaylovich.

[Falin] Let me begin, then, with a correction. Unfortunately, I did not have the pleasure to attend or to observe the events occuring at Geneva at close quarters. In response to your question, I would like to recall a piece of wisdom expressed and formulated in his time by the great poet Friedrich Schiller. He said: Try to find the eternal law in the inconstant transformations of events.

I think that both sides in Washington exerted effort to see the essential and basic things behind the diverse, very complicated, and very ancient—in terms of the time they have been part of our relations—contradictions and differences with which both we and probably the Americans link our hopes. We do not have the right to deny ourselves, and moreover our heirs, the right of choice, but we will deny them this right if we further condemn mankind to a life under conditions of an arms race and destruction of the environment.

If on both sides we recognize the need for development, then we must forever reject the formula of ultimatums: Who is not with us is against us. If we recognize that development is essential as a condition of life, then we must admit that the most perfect is not perfect, that the stable is unstable, insofar as if we do not advance and constantly renew our own idea of the past and present, we will never make this world better. I think that herein lies Washington's lesson in philosophy: We did not provide answers to many problems and could not provide them, and this impossible task was not set. Nevertheless, we took a step forward—not towards recognizing in words the need for new thinking, but in ensuring that this thinking yields practical results and benefits to people.

[Zorin] Georgiy Arkadyevich.

[Arbatov] Yes, you know I agree with what Valentin Mikhaylovich has said, but for my part, I would also like to share a few ideas. People now automatically think that during the seventies we had a period of improving relations—detente—which was later replaced by a new paroxysm of cold war and arms race. Now they do not think only about this. During the Washington meeting I was asked by several old American acquaintances of mine: Are there any guarantees now that this will not be some kind of transient event that will later—with the same inevitability that autumn follows summer, and winter follows autumn—once again be replaced by a fit of cold war?

This is not a simple question, and it is not easy to respond to it, insofar as we have not yet reached such the degree of accuracy in forecasts that exists in some other spheres. Nevertheless, I think it can be answered, and I see a great difference: We have made great advances as compared to the seventies, and I do see certain guarantees.

First, the scale of the nuclear threat is better understood everywhere. I think that Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke about this when he was answering your question at the Washington news conference. It has undoubtedly become clearer to people, and today there is practically no more or less responsible politician who could say that a nuclear war can be waged and won. Everyone understands what a nuclear war means.

Secondly, we have acquired some experience. Saying this, I mean the USSR and our policy—and I have the policies of other countries in mind as well, but primarily I would like to speak about ourselves. The history of the seventies has not been written yet—it is still waiting for its historians—but one can already say that we either did not sufficiently appreciate the time factor, or we could not appreciate it—and there may have been objective reason for this—or the fact that no chance should be lost, because a lost chance is usually a chance lost forever. It is never repeated. Probably, something could have been done, notwithstanding all the objective difficulties, which undoubtedly existed. We could not comprehend that the period favorable for progress along the path of normalizing relations with the United States, for disarmament, and so forth, at the beginning of the seventies, would be so short.

I think that another thing is connected with this: We ourselves have changed very seriously. In this respect I think that this is primarily the restructuring that is

underway in our country. This also includes the manifestations—and I use a term that has become a household word—known as stagnation, which occured in our country and had international repercussions, bad international repercussions. In the same sphere are the successes of our restructuring. The success of what is happening inside will have great positive results.

Further, we have the enormous role of our foreign policy. You see, the saying that it takes two to tango has been cited more than once by Reagan, by our side, by journalists—and it was cited in forewords to peace and disarmament agreements. I would take the risk of using this saying in the foreword to something else: It also takes two to have a cold war or an arms race. In other words, you are not free: Some things can be foisted on you. But if you possess—well, today we call the new thinking new, but really, if it is very profound and corresponds with the realities of political thinking, then it first and foremost forces you to reject the rules of the game that the other side is attempting to foist on you and refuse to accept battle on the bridgehead he is trying to shove at you.

We could not always do this with sufficient skill. Now, a certain prominent U.S. public figure, in determining his opinion as to what is now happening and what influence Soviet policy has, made the following analogy. He said: There is a universally-known game called tug-of-war, in which two people or two groups of people get hold of a rope and pull. Now, you have decided to let go of the rope: So what happens to the other side in this case? Take all of these asymmetrical actions, like the extended moratorium, new initiatives, flexibility, readiness for compromise, and a completely different political understanding of a mutually-dependent world and the new rules of the game in this world—new rules of behavior according to which you cannot build plans for your own security at the expense or detriment of the other side. All this played a very significant role, and this instills great confidence that the game now will not proceed according to the rules that the champions of the cold war would like. They understand this very well.

The risk of excessive confidence is today far less than the risk of excessive suspicion. Today excessive suspicion can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. In other words, you will get yours according to how you behave. In this respect our policy generally—well, every policy has a known risk, so to speak, anything courageous and innovative has something in common—is basically safe because if the other side accepts these proposals, proposals for a new approach to security, a new attitude to peace, to relations with one another, to military force, then radical changes will occur for the better. If it does not accept them, then I think that with the current state of thinking America will find itself an outcast in the world community.

If it insists, despite these major changes—which we also promote with our policy—in the thinking of both Americans and America's allies and of the world public—if it adheres to old policies it will find itself on the edge. Therefore, I think that Washington did not occur in a vacuum. The ground was prepared through great efforts and preparations. Our country's leadership devoted enourmous efforts to this meeting.

I would like to conclude on a note of well-known caution. As happens in the lives of every one of us, at a certain age and in certain circumstances we decide to take care of our own health. We decide to quit smoking, to reject other bad habits, to engage in physical culture, and generally do everything that the doctors suggest, and so forth. This is very good. It is a very important, because it can extend your life. It is a question of your life. But it depends on how you will conduct yourself after you have made this decision. If after a few days you forget about it and everything returns to old ways—this happens often in life—then everything will end up in failure. If it becomes a real change and you really get the upper hand of—well, that lofty understanding of the problems that reigned in Washington a few days ago, and you build your actions in accordance with this, then this could become an outstanding landmark in the development of international relations.

[Zorin] Thank you. Well, our time on the air has run out. Of course, we will return to the problems relating to this outstanding event more than once. Now it remains for me to thank you for your participation in our program and to thank our television viewers for their attention. So, until we meet again here in Studio 9. Thank you.

Laotian Letter to UN Protests Thai Hostility

LD212204 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 21 TASS—The Laotian side regards Thailand's hostile actions as "the most serious over the 12-year existence of People's Laos", points out a letter by Laotian permanent representative addressed to the U.N. secretary general.

The letter circulated today as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council points out that for the first time in 12 years Thailand gave orders to its air force to bombard the Laotian territory during incidents along the border between the two countries. This serious incident took place at a time when the international situation is conducive to reaching political solutions of both world and regional problems on the basis of a dialogue and negotiations.

The Laotian Government believes that the most reasonable way of defusing tension in relations between the two countries is for the Thai side to resume the talks with the Laotian side as soon as possible to achieve peace in the region, the document says.

United States & Canada

Reagan Discusses Ratification With Senators

LD212015 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 21 TASS—President Reagan invited once again today leading Republican senators to discuss prospects for the ratification of the INF (Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces) Treaty in the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress. This is already the second in the last several days meeting of the head of the administration with members of the special group of Republican senators formed to study the INF Treaty.

UPI news agency points out that the President carries on the campaign pressing for members of his own party to support the new treaty. The agreement will be ratified by the Senate if two thirds of the members of Congress' upper chamber vote for it. White House official spokesmen forecast that the administration will be able to enlist support of the necessary number of senators for the treaty to be ratified.

Soviet, U.S. Public Polled on Summit Results

PM211051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report followed by N. Prozhogin commentary: "The Majority Approve"]

[Text] Soviet People's Opinion [subhead]

Within the framework of the "International Peace Barometer" program the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute conducted a public opinion poll among the population of Moscow. Professor V.N. Ivanov, program director and director of the institute, says:

The poll covered 500 telephone subscribers and revealed great satisfaction with the results of the meeting. Forty-two percent of those polled assessed its outcome as "very good," and 44% as "good." Twelve percent considered its results satisfactory. The latter evidently includes the 5% for whom the meeting's results did not meet their expectations. But for 6 out of every 10 people its results coincided with the expectations they had formed prior to the meeting. Approximately one-third (31%) said that what had been achieved in Washington surpassed their expectations.

The sample proved very well-informed. Eighty-four percent declared that they had followed the course of the meeting attentively, and only 16% without special attention. The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles had attracted the greatest attention—9 out of 10 of those polled (89%) had watched or listened to that ceremony. However, our public opinion has not yet formed an unambiguous attitude toward this treaty—37% believe that it will strengthen the USSR's security. Forty-three percent make a more restrained assessment of it, believing that it will not harm it, while 8% think that definite harm will be done. Twelve percent did not define their attitude toward the treaty.

Opinions were also divided as to assessments of the prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations following the meeting. Twenty-eight percent believe that they "will improve significantly," but 6 out of 10 (61%) anticipate only a certain improvement. Six percent think that there will be no change, while 5% believe that there could be a certain deterioration in these relations. Nevertheless, an absolute majority (93%) are in favor of holding a new meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan (3% are against it). Many people associate with the next meeting the expectation that a treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms will be agreed on by the time it starts. Fifty-five percent believe that there is a large or average degree of likelihood that such a treaty will be prepared by the time of the Moscow meeting. Almost 1 in 5 (18%) believe there is little likelihood of this, while the way the question was formulated proved too complex for the rest to reply.

I believe that the results of the Washington meeting have influenced Muscovites' assessment of prospects for 1988. Almost half (47%) are inclined to think it will be a peaceful year, without serious international disagreements, while one-fourth think that it will be similar to this year in international life. [Ivanov ends]

The USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration also conducted a telephone poll of Muscovites on their attitude to the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Nineteen percent of the 500 people covered by that poll assess the results of the meeting as very good, 54% as good, and 26% as satisfactory.

In the opinion of 64%, the Soviet side displayed greater political flexibility and desire to achieve accords. Two percent believe that there were more of these qualities on the U.S. side. Twenty-five percent believe that the desire for an accord was equally characteristic of both sides. Eighty-two percent said that the democratization and restructuring taking place in our country contributed to the success of the talks.

Americans' Opinion [subhead]

More than 80% of Americans believe that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting resulted in the attainment of important accords in relations between the two countries. Precisely 505 people participated in a poll jointly conducted by ABC TV and THE WASHINGTON POST. Eighty-two percent of the Americans said that the meeting led to important accords, 15% declared that it did not lead to accords in Soviet-U.S. relations, and 3% declined to answer.

Seventy-six percent of the Americans agreed that the USSR and the United States are entering a new era in which relations between the two countries will be far better than before. Nineteen percent disagreed with that opinion, 2% declared that it is too early to draw such conclusions, and 3% refused to answer.

NEWSWEEK has reported that a public opinion poll conducted by the Gallup Institute after the Washington summit meeting showed that 74% of Americans polled approve of President Reagan's activity in normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations. On the whole, approval for his policy is up 9% from last month.

Seventy-three percent favored Senate ratification of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Thirty-seven percent voiced confidence that the procedures enshrined in the treaty for monitoring its fulfillment are effective.

Ninety percent of those polled believe that the Washington summit meeting has improved Soviet-U.S. relations. Data from the study attest that 76% of Americans want President Reagan to sign a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms during his upcoming visit to Moscow.

Our Commentary [subhead]

Having obtained from the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute the results of the public opinion poll on problems connected with the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, we put them alongside data from another poll carried out by the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration. Readers will, of course, have noted the numerical differences in the assessments, although both polls were conducted in Moscow and with an equal number of participants. Clearly, this reflects the relativity of information obtained in the course of such studies. Yet they provide an opportunity to form an idea—on the whole correct—of public sentiments. What did the polls show?

There is, above all, the approval by the overwhelming majority of the population for the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States, which constitute a concrete new step toward implementing the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state aimed at creating a nuclear-free world. Whereas 86% assessed the results of the visit as "very good" and "good" according to the first poll, 80% of those polled in the second one made the same assessments, although in the inverse ratio. [figures and sentence as published]

People want to see real actions leading to nuclear disarmament, as manifested in the heightened interest in the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. But another significant factor is the concern over security interests associated, as follows from a comparison with replies to other questions, with the reaching of an agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms.

It follows from the published results of polls conducted in the United States that U.S. public opinion is similar to the aspirations of Soviet people. The majority of Americans approve of the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, favor its ratification by the Senate, and hope an agreement will be reached on a reduction in strategic offensive arms.

According to the results of another poll conducted by AP, the overwhelming majority of leaders of newspapers, news agencies, and radio and television stations on all continents believe that the Soviet-U.S. meeting and the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles were the chief events of 1987. Of the 119 leaders of the mass media polled in 44 countries, 74 declared that that meeting is more significant than other events in the outgoing year.

I do not think I will be wrong if I point out in conclusion that the poll results, while relating to what has already been done, are also directed toward the future. In welcoming the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting the peoples of our two countries, as well as of the whole world, expect the first step in the cause of nuclear disarmament to be followed by new ones.

Despite Summit, Soviet Workers Refused Visas

PM181631 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 3

[Article by own Political Observer A. Repin: "Strange Logic"]

[Text] The United States has practiced a discriminatory visa policy toward representatives of Soviet working people and their trade unions for many years. The U.S. State Department has systematically refused visas to ordinary workers, trade union leaders, and even members of tourist groups made up of Soviet working people. But the latest act of discrimination by the Washington authorities is particularly provocative: The day after the Soviet-U.S. summit finished, on 11 December, that is, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow made officially known its refusal to issue visas to a delegation of Soviet workers invited by the Chicago newspaper LABOR TODAY—the organ of the national center for labor union action and democracy, which is an organization for rank-and-file members of American labor unions.

The composition of the delegation was fully in keeping with the character of the side issuing the invitation—those about to set off for the United States were ordinary Soviet workers. It was made up of the following: V.M. Kurbakov, steelworker at Moscow's "Serp i Molot" Metallurgical Plant; T.V. Nebaykina, inspector at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich Electrical Engineering Plant; N.V. Solomenko, equipment repairman at Moscow's

N.V. Likhachev Automobile Plant; and S.Ya. Shmakov, senior lecturer at Moscow's M. Thorez State Foreign Language Teaching Institute, who was to act as interpreter.

As Debbie Albano, editor of LABOR TODAY, told TRUD's Washington correspondent, when she asked why the Soviet workers were refused visas, a State Department official replied that it was "on the grounds of the McCarran-Walter Act." This immigration law was adopted at the height of the cold war, in 1952, and was aimed particularly at isolating U.S. working people from their class brothers in other countries on the pretext of the "communist peril." Through pressure of circumstances this law of the witch-hunt era was softened in 1977 by an amendment from Senator George McGovern which opened up the opportunity for Americans to invite visitors from socialist countries. It was then—and, incidentally, at the invitation of the national center for labor union activity and democracy—that a delegation of Soviet workers visited the United States for the first time after a long gap. However, in 1979, an amendment moved by Senator Baker (present White House chief of staff) was adopted which annulled the McGovern amendment, and everything had gone full circle.

The McCarran-Walter Act is applied not only to Soviet trade union delegations invited to the United States but even in cases where Soviet trade union representatives are sent there as delegates to take part in conferences, symposiums, and seminars, including those held by the United Nations and other international organizations. In 1986, for example, N.A. Trofimyuk, chief of the AUCCTU State Social Insurance Department, was unable to take part in a seminar held by the Internatational Social Security Association in Baltimore. In the spring of 1987 a Soviet delegation of trade union figures and scientific workers invited to take part in a conference on work safety in Washington was refused visas.

In all the U.S. State Department has refused visas to representatives of Soviet working people and trade union workers around 20 times since 1981. In those rare instances where entry to the United States has been permitted, visas have mostly been issued with discriminatory provisos (verbal or written): There is to be no contact with U.S. labor unions.

As for the USSR, Soviet trade unions regularly receive both official delegations from a whole range of U.S. sector unions and numerous labor union tourist groups. How long will this situation, this situation which Americans call a "one-way street," continue?

Back at the Soviet-U.S. summit in 1985 both sides put forward initiatives in the sphere of expanding contacts. Since then tens of thousands of Soviet and U.S. citizens have been involved in the process of expanding such ties. But it has to be said that this has had very little impact on contacts among trade unions—the largest social organizations in the two countries. For example, Soviet trade union representatives who took part in a meeting of the Soviet and U.S. public in Chautauqua were there not as trade union workers but as tourists.

The Soviet-U.S. Joint Statement made during the recent summit meeting in Washington notes that "M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan have confirmed the importance of contacts and exchanges for increasing understanding between the two peoples."

It is logical to expect real improvements here from the U.S. side. Summit statements lay down certain obligations. The actions of the State Department, then, which deemed it appropriate to refuse visas to Soviet workers and to announce this on 11 December, indicate a strange—to put it mildly—understanding of such obligations.

In short, the State Department stance on the question of contacts regarding trade union ties and direct dialogue between the working people of the two countries is one of those areas in Soviet-U.S. relations where, as the CPSU Central Committee general secretary pointed out in his speech on Soviet television, "it is still too early to talk about a radical breakthrough in our relations...."

Kornilov on 'Iron Curtain' Immigration Laws
LD211950 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec TASS—Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that Congress has sent a draft law to the President intended "temporarily and partially" to halt operation of the McCarran-Walter Act. What are they talking about? Let us recall that the essence of the law adopted as far back as 1952 at the height of McCarthyism, is the strict limitation of entry into the country for "ideological motives." Acting on the basis of that law, the Washington "champions of democracy" for many years have put down an "Iron Curtain" in front of many people whose convictions and views do not coincide with the outlooks of those who have settled on the peak of Washington's political Olympus. It is far from being a question only of Communists, or only of Soviet scientists, trade union activists, or journalists. Among those whose views were counted "dangerous" by Washington are the former Italian senator Nino Pasti; Hortensia Bussi de Allende, the widow of the assassinated president of Chile; and the outstanding Colombian writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez. This list could be continued: According to U.S. press information, the U.S. State Department's computer files contain 40,000 - 50,000 citizens of other countries, for whom entry to the United States is closed because, precisely, of their "ideological motives."

The new draft bill emerged after it became quite clear that the powers that be in the United States could no longer ignore the opinion of the international and indeed

the American public, which points out that the McCarran-Walter law is a left-over from McCarthyism and the cold war. However, many observers and press organs are wondering why it is in fact that the talk in the upper echelons in Washington is only about certain "temporary", "partial" measures, and not about a complete and decisive abolition of the antidemocratic, overtly reactionary law which one U.S. legislator, Steny Hoyer, quite justifiably described in the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST on 2 September as a U.S. "national disgrace"?

The answer to this question is obvious: Although the Washington administration, never missing the chance to try to pass itself off as a "champion of human rights," avoids public assertions of its [illegible] to McCarthyite methods, in fact the poisonous [illegible] nted in American soil in McCarthy's time [illegible] ll bloom. The McCarran-Walter Act is [illegible] the aid of which Washington inter[illegible] a struggle against "penetration [illegible] appropriate to recall in [illegible] although the ruling circles in [illegible] ne United States as a "refuge for t[illegible] ed," the quota for allowing entry of re[illegible] country has in 4 years (1981-85) been reduced from 217,000 to 70,000. They are contriving to interpret the very concept of "refugee" in such a way that it proves to be applicable basically to people leaving the socialist countries, while the masses of people trying to escape repression by antipeople cliques and ultrareactionary regimes nurtured by Washington itself find themselves in the category of "undesirables," for whom entry to the United States is closed. We are saying nothing about the very harsh restrictions which the United States is establishing for so-called "economic emigrees", fencing off the country from the outside world by metal walls—fences near which there stand detachments of specially drilled machine gunners, and which extend, at the U.S.-Mexico border, for example, for hundreds of kilometers.

"For 35 years the legislation banning entry into the United States of foreign nonimmigrants for ideological reasons has put our country into a ridiculous position and has undermined respect for the freedom which we aspire to extend everywhere in the world," U.S. Democratic Senator Daniel Moynihan observes. Facts are facts. Will the powers that be in the United States really permit the "Iron Curtain" they have built to be cleared away? So far, at any rate, it does not seem very likely.

Document Implicates Bush in Irangate

LD181722 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 18 TASS—96 new documents pertaining to the secret Iran-contras operation have been extracted by specialists from computer archives of the White House. This was reported on Thursday by Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on secret military assistance to Iran and the Nicaraguan opposition Senator Daniel Inouye and his deputy Senator Warren Rudman.

Members of special congressional commissions for the Irangate investigation have got a possibility to get acquainted with the notes exchanged by the main parties to the scandalous affair—former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs John Poindexter, his predecessor in the post Robert McFarlane and former member of the National Security Council Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North. Only three out of these documents have been so far declassified.

The documents reaffirm once again the involvement of top representatives of the U.S. Administration in the Iran-contras affair.

In one of the documents, the UPI writes, it is said that Vice President George Bush fully supported the covert deal with Iran and he and President Reagan firmly abided by the opinion on the need for trying to carry out that operation. As was stated by Senator Daniel Inouye, this is the first testimony that caused his commission's concern over the position held by George Bush towards the Iranian deal.

George Bush who is now the main presidential contender from the Republican Party stubbornly denies that he knew anything about the Iran-contras operation, the UPI notes, and the publication of new documents might strike a heavy blow on his election campaign.

The materials extracted from the White House archives were handed over to special prosecutor Lawrence Walsh who is conducting the criminal investigation with regard to the main parties to the Irangate.

New York December 18 TASS—Following the Irangate scandal, the CIA director William Webster has dismissed former CIA station chief in Costa Rica and the chief of the large CIA base at Aguacate, Honduras. Director of the agency's counterterrorism centre and head of the CIA's Central America task force were subjected to disciplinary punishment.

The newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL regards these measures as an attempt "to mollify the CIA's congressional critics who want to impose new restrictions on covert operations of the CIA which played one of the key roles in the Iran-contras affair. [no closing quotation mark as received]

IZVESTIYA Views Hart's Re-Entry, Chances

PM211133 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch under the "Reports From Abroad" rubric: "United States: The Return of Gary Hart?"]

[Excerpts] New York—Gary Hart has returned. The former senator from Colorado announced Tuesday that he intends to put forward his nomination for the post of U.S. President after all.

No one expected this. Everyone, absolutely everyone, was convinced that he would never recover from the tremendous scandal which broke last May. Let us recall: The senator was accused then of marital infidelity. Now Hart is once again a contender. His justification is: "Let the people decide," that is the electorate. Let them decide who is the most worthy. [passage omitted]

There is as yet no one who thinks that Hart has a chance of receiving the support of the Democratic Party and becoming its official candidate. The fact that Hart is in fact bankrupt and that he effectively has no means of conducting an election campaign—he still has a debt of approximately $2 million from the 1984 campaign—is being taken into consideration, among other things.

Nor can it be disregarded that in giving up the fight for the Presidency in May, Hart not only indirectly confirmed the charges made against him but also displayed weakness of character and weakness of will, which is the biggest minus that a politician can have in the eyes of the U.S. electorate.

Won't Hart, who has no chance of success, harm other Democrats, instill nervousness into their ranks, intensify infighting, and ultimately weaken the Democrats as a party in the upcoming clash with the Republicans at the polls? Observers are now asking this question. Answers are already forthcoming. As the chairman of the Republican Party National Committee said when he was asked to comment on Gary Hart's return, "I am simply delighted."

Report on U.S. Aid to DRA 'Bandits' Hit

LD221022 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0200 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Washington 22 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The U.S. State Department has issued another "report" on the situation in Afghanistan. The section entitled 'U.S. policy' contains the assertion that the United States aspires to "a negotiated settlement in Afghanistan, and that "Washington supports the efforts of the personal representative of the UN secretary general aimed at achieving a settlement." [quotation marks as received]

How close to reality are such assurances? Perhaps Washington has decided to stop delivery arms [as received] to the bandits in order to create the right conditions for the intensification and speediest successful conclusion of the talks on settling the situation around Afghanistan? There is no evidence of this in the report. On the contrary, it states plainly that the United States is to continue its "resolute support for the cause of the Afghan people," which is the name they give in Washington to supplies of the most modern weaponry to the counterrevolutionaries, who use it to sow death and destruction on Afghan soil.

It is highly remarkable that the report studiously avoids the question of arms supplies to bandit military units. It talks only of "humanitarian aid" which reached $30 million in 1987, while in 1988 the level planned is $52 million. There is not one word in the report about volume of purely military aid or about what types of weapon the United States is supplying to the bandits, although the cost of these supplies is tens of times higher that the cost of the "humanitarian aid." According to THE WASHINGTON POST the U.S. Congress allocated $1,071,000,000 for kindling the war in Afghanistan between 1983 and 1987, of which the lion's share was for military purposes. Among the most modern types of weapon supplied by the United States to the bandits were over 600 Stinger antiaircraft missiles, which they use to shoot down not only military but also civilian aircraft. Directive 166 on Afghanistan, which was signed by President Reagan in April 1985 in accordance with which the United States sends weapons to the bandits has still not been abolished or even amended.

Officials Comment on Spaceflight Cooperation

PM210957 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87 First Edition p 3

[Moscow interview with V. Barsukov, director of the Academy of Sciences Geochemistry and Analytical Chemistry Institute and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, and NASA official S. Keller by A. Nemov and A. Cherkudinov: "Soviet-U.S. Solar System Research Program. There Will Be Take-Offs for the 'Red Planet'"; date of interview not given; quotation marks as published; first two paragraphs are correspondents' introduction]

[Text] Man is confidently making space habitable—manned orbital flights are already nearly a year long in duration, and interplanetary stations millions of kilometers from earth are conducting the most complex research into other planets. You would think that the time of the space skeptic had gone, never to return. Yet to this day many doubters remain. They cite cost as one of the main arguments for cutting back research. Space programs are indeed rather costly. We can see only one way out here—the internationalization of space projects and broad international cooperation in this sphere.

The final documents of a conference of the Soviet-U.S. working group on solar system research have been signed in Moscow.

The leader of the group on the Soviet side, V. Barsukov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Geochemistry and Analytical Chemistry Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said:

"Mutual coordination of our space programs to study the planets of the solar system is simply essential today. For instance, we gave U.S. scientists a complete set of maps of the surface of Venus, which we obtained with the help

of our 'Venus-15' and 'Venus-16' stations. This is playing its part in preparing for the flight of NASA automated stations to this planet within the framework of the 'Magellan' program in 1989. On the other hand, photographs of Mars handed to us by our colleagues from the United States will help in finally elaborating the 'Phobos' program. Such exchanges will enable us to save both efforts and funds.

"The agreement also envisages closer cooperation between the countries. U.S. scientists will be involved in analyzing the results of the flight of the Soviet automated stations which will take off for Mars next July. In 1992 Soviet researchers will participate in the U.S. 'Mars Observer' program."

"Achieving the ultimate objective of the study of Mars—bringing back Martian soil to earth—requires considerable preliminary work. In particular, creating an engineering model of the planet (models of the surface, atmosphere, and gravitational field), studying its surface from orbit, and finally, landing automated craft on Mars."

S. Keller, one of the NASA leaders for planetary research, continued the Soviet scientist's account:

"The document which we have signed opens up wide prospects for Soviet-U.S. cooperation in space research. It is as it were a practical step toward the implementation of the cooperation agreement between the two countries signed last April. The present agreement provides for joint action in studying certain planets in the solar system—Venus, Mars, and its satellites."

[Nemov and Cherkudinov] Is there any possible hope that any life forms exist on Mars?"

[Keller] U.S. research has not confirmed this as yet. I think that even if there was any biological activity on this planet there isn't any now. But not everyone shares this viewpoint. Including certain Soviet scientists who think that in principle primitive life may exist on Mars even now. The upcoming space experiments will be able to greatly clarify this question.

[Nemov and Cherkudinov] How feasible is a manned flight to Mars in the future? If such a flight does take place will it be a joint Soviet-U.S. flight?

[Keller] I can say with conviction that a manned landing on Mars will not take place within 15-20 years—that is, we are talking about the next century. But for this to occur we must carry out a tremendous amount of research. Including joint research with Soviet specialists. As yet there have not been even any preliminary projects for a joint manned flight to Mars. The future must show how possible they are in principle and if they are possible then the leading countries in space research—the USSR and the United States—will hardly remain on the sidelines.

[Nemov and Cherkudinov] Last year the "Challenger" shuttle exploded during take-off and the crew perished. How do matters stand today with the use of this type of spacecraft?

[Keller] After the tragedy we were faced with a huge number of problems. The main one is associated with the need to verify all the shuttle's systems most thoroughly in order to ensure flight safety. This work is so vast and complex that at this time I cannot give a date for its completion.

Envoy Briefs Canadians on INF Accord

LD181249 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Ottawa December 18 TASS—Ambassador A.M. Aleksandrov-Agentov, Soviet special envoy, stayed here on December 15-17. He briefed the Canadian Government on the assessment given by the Soviet leaders of the outcome of the talks in Washington between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The Soviet representative and USSR Ambassador to Canada A.A. Rodionov were received by Canada's Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. A meeting was also held with Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs Joseph Clark.

The Canadian statesmen pointed out the tremendous significance of the Soviet-American summit meeting and the treaty eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which was signed in the course of the meeting.

The prime minister said that the Canadian Government and people consider the agreement reached at the summit meeting to be a history-making document, an important step directed at building a better and safer world. The treaty signed in Washington is triumph for common sense. Both sides have displayed great statesmanship. The treaty would have hardly come about without the Soviet Union's new constructive approach to disarmament issues.

The prime minister laid special emphasis on the role played in ensuring the success of the meeting in Washington by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. What he did in the course of the summit meeting was a manifestation of great policy in action.

Brian Mulroney pointed out Canada's wish to do its utmost to promote international detente and strengthen universal peace.

China

Fishing Protocol Signed With PRC in Moscow

LD220148 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow 21 December (TASS)—A deepening of the cooperation between the USSR and the PRC in fishing is envisaged in a protocol signed today in Moscow after 2 weeks of talks. As was noted at the signing,

the fulfillment of what has been mapped out will raise bilateral links in this industry to a higher level than in the fifties and sixties.

Included in the plan for scientific and technical cooperation in the period from 1988 to 1990 is research into fish stocks and ways of restoring them, as well as means of breeding fresh-water fish in internal reservoirs. Elaboration of these topics is intended to facilitate the organization of cooperation in the production sphere, too.

Ways for developing direct links between the Soviet 'Dalryba' association [Far Eastern Fishing Directorate] and the Chinese associated fishing company have already been determined. Thus, it is intended that fish caught by Soviet fishermen will be processed at PRC enterprises. As part of barter operations, the Chinese partner will supply sea kale to the USSR and the Soviet association will supply fish produce, including canned products, to the PRC. It is also planned to set up a joint enterprise producing canned herring in China. It will then be exported to the Soviet Union.

The prospects for cooperation in such areas as the repair of fishing vessels, artificial breeding, and sensible use of fish in the Amur and Ussuri Rivers were also discussed. The Chinese side expressed interest in obtaining the right to fish walleye pollock in the 200-mile economic zone of the USSR, with appropriate compensation.

At the talks it was decided to study the matter of concluding an intergovernmental Soviet-Chinese agreement on cooperation in the fishing industry.

During its stay in the USSR, the PRC delegation visited Tashkent and Leningrad and acquainted itself with the work of fishing enterprises in these towns.

Impact of PRC Reforms on Interest Groups Viewed
PM211337 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 4

[TASS correspondent G. Krivosheyev dispatch especially for MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, under the "Facts, Events, Opinions" rubric: "China: Reforms and Opinions"]

[Text] Beijing, 1 Dec—It is an indisputable fact that there are groups of people with diverse interests in today's China. This has been caused by reforms of the economic system and the political structure that are being implemented in the country. Chinese sociologists reached this conclusion after studying the data from a public opinion poll in the country's largest industrial center, the city of Shanghai.

Prior to implementation of reforms, the weekly BEIJING REVIEW reports, the practice of the "big pot"—this is what they call leveling here—existed in the country. The protracted "extreme leftist" influence, which in China affected all aspects of the country's sociopolitical life, prevented people from understanding that diverse interests exist in the country, while the contradictions between them were presented as a "class struggle."

In the process of reform, along with the emergence of the private sector in the country's economy, development of commodity-money relations, and growth in the role of the market, changes have also taken place in relations between the interests of groups of people. Studying these was an important task facing the country's sociologists. Today, as the opinion poll has shown, groups of people with diverse interests are also making different demands on the policy being implemented. State employees, including senior officials, the managerial apparatus in the industry, school teachers, and VUZ students hope that their social position will be enhanced as a result of the transformations being implemented. The working class, trade workers, and secondary school students would like to receive more freedom in choosing a profession and also an increase in personal income. The more demands there are for reform, the less satisfaction those who demand them get from real changes.

The overwhelming majority of China's population, the magazine notes, supports the reforms, yet at the same time expresses dissatisfaction with the unresolved problems. But diverse population groups have diverse sources of dissatisfaction. For instance, the problem of price increases affects everyone; however, city dwellers are more concerned by an increase in food prices, whereas the peasantry are more concerned by an increase in prices for industrial commodities. As for the development of democracy, young intellectuals are most interested in implementing the political aspect of reform, whereas workers are most interested in the need to introduce greater freedom in choosing a trade and place of work. PRC scientists believe that the mass media must provide wider coverage of the differences between the interests of the various group so that groundless dissatisfaction does not arise among the people's masses.

The magazine stresses that "the reforms in China are extraordinarily complex, and the rise of diverse opinions and conflicts between groups in society is inevitable during their implementation. However, under socialism, the contradictions between population groups cannot shake the foundations of the socieconomic system itself, if the emergent contradictions are correctly resolved. Nor will they be able to exert an adverse effect on stability in society."

Bilateral Economic Cooperation Assessed
OW220850 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Vasilyev commentary]

[Excerpts] The USSR and China signed an accord on economic and technical cooperation in July 1985. According to this accord, the Soviet Union will help

China construct and overhaul a number of power, ferrous and non-ferrous metal industry, machine-building industry, coal mining industry, and chemical industry projects. [passage omitted]

While economic cooperation between the two nations is proceeding smoothly, and while the two countries are facing some similar tasks in accelerating their socioeconomic development, prospects for expanding economic cooperation between them look bright. For this reason, the Soviet Union and China have vigorously explored new possibilities and directions for economic, trade, and scientific and technical cooperation, such as setting up joint ventures, tapping resources along border areas, and establishing direct contact between neighboring cities, ministries, and departments. For instance, the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR and the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and Trade of the PRC have forged direct commercial ties. [passage omitted]

(Zupolitskiy), an official from the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, has given a detailed account on how the USSR and China are exploring new possibilities and directions for their cooperation.

(Zupolitskiy) said: Currently, the Soviet Union and China have been studying and discussing a wide range of possible areas of cooperation, including metallurgical plants and chicken farms. Besides, the two sides have discussed and studied the conditions for and development of cooperation with an eye to mutual interest. They have also discussed and analyzed the possibility of establishing joint ventures with state and business loans. [passage omitted]

(Zupolitskiy) said: One new development in Soviet-Chinese cooperation is the plan to jointly build a thermos bottle plant on Soviet territory. Work meetings of Soviet and Chinese experts concerning this project have been held to discuss and analyze the economic and technical aspects of it being built in the USSR. An accord on the preparation for this project has been signed. In short, the potential for cooperation between the two countries is great. People of the two countries have steadily moved toward the path of cooperation. However, we have walked only a few steps along this path. As the saying goes, a ten thousand-mile march starts with the first step.

Experts Discuss Joint Industrial Venture

OW220917 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Soviet and Chinese delegations of experts have begun talks in Beijing on establishing the first Soviet-Chinese joint industrial enterprise. It is planned that this enterprise will be set up in the Uzbekistan SSR of the Soviet Union. It will produce consumer goods for civilian use and, at the same time, expand the Soviet Union's technical aid to China. According to several agreements signed, the Soviet Union will help modernize a number of China's light industrial enterprises and petrochemical factories.

Beijing Musicians Received by Amity Society

OW220841 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society was host to the visiting delegation from the Beijing Central Conservatory in Moscow on 18 December. The delegation was led by Professor Wu Zuqiang, president of the conservatory.

Sergey Leonidovich Tikhvinskiy, chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, welcomed the guests and had a cordial and friendly conversation with them. He spoke highly of the recent performance in Moscow by the Beijing Central Conservatory's youth symphony orchestra.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Meets With SRV's Nguyen Co Thach

LD211554 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow , 21 Dec (TASS)—A meeting took place today between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and SRV foreign minister. The latter was in Moscow on his way to Hungary, Albania, and some other European countries, where he is going for official visits.

During the conversation, which passed in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and unanimity, topical issues of international life, including the situation in the Southeast Asia, and the situation around Cambodia were discussed.

The exceptional importance of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit was stressed during an examination of international problems. Nguyen Co Thach noted that the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed during the visit to the United States by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, became an historic step on the road to real nuclear disarmament, gave a powerful impulse to achieving progress in other areas of disarmament, and in settling many complex problems of today's world.

Eduard Shevardnadze and Nguyen Co Thach welcomed the positive moves for a Cambodian settlement and the beginning of political dialogue between the Cambodian sides. They expressed decisive support for the efforts by the PRK to implement the policy of national reconciliation in Cambodia in the interests of the people of that

country and for the sake of peace and security in Southeast Asia. The readiness of the Soviet Union and Vietnam to go on, along with other interested states, contributing to unblocking the conflict situation around Cambodia was stressed.

Mutual satisfaction was expressed at the degree of coordination of actions by the USSR and SRV in the international arena, and of their efforts to implement the idea of guaranteeing security and the development of broad cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region.

Further on Chebrikov Visit to SRV

Arrives in Hanoi

LD211204 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Hanoi, 21 Dec (TASS)—V.M. Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security, arrived in Hanoi today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and the SRV Government.

The guest was met in the Vietnamese capital by Pham Hung, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Interior Minister Mai Chi Tho; and by other officials.

Meets With Pham Hung, Others

LD221128 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1008 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Hanoi, 22 Dec (TASS)—Pham Hung, member of the CPV [Communist Party of Vietnam] Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, today received Viktor Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR KGB, who is in Vietnam on an official friendly visit.

During a conversation which passed in a frank and friendly atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on issues of life in the two countries, cooperation between the USSR and the SRV, and on a number of international and regional problems. It was noted that the revolutionary processes of radical restructuring and of profound renewal in all spheres of political, economic and public life which are taking place in the Soviet Union and in Vietnam are promoting the further development and strengthening of cooperation between the CPSU and the CPV, and between the governments and peoples of the two countries.

The Vietnamese leader gave a high appraisal to the results of the visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressing in particular the immense importance of the Treaty on Eliminating Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which is a first step on the road to nuclear disarmament. It was emphasized that the success of the Washington summit meeting was a consequence of the foreign policy course elaborated at the 27th CPSU Congress, the result of the new political thinking, and the fruit of the joint efforts of the socialist countries in the struggle for an end to the arms race, for disarmament, and for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

Taking part in the conversation on the Vietnamese side were Mai Chi Tho, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo, SRV minister of internal affairs; and Dinh Nho Liem, SRV first vice minister of foreign affairs. The meeting was attended by D.I. Kachin, USSR ambassador to the SRV.

V.M. Chebrikov and the officials accompanying him visited the Ho Chi Minh mausoleum and laid a wreath. The Soviet guests became acquainted with the house-museum of the outstanding figure of the international communist and national liberation movement. V.M. Chebrikov left an inscription in the visitors' book.

On the same day, V.M. Chebrikov laid flowers at the foot of the memorial erected in Tilang Square in the center of the Vietnamese capital to V.I. Lenin, the great leader of the world proletariat.

Korolev Views ASEAN Stand on Nuclear Arms

BK200803 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1500 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Vladimir Korolev commentary: "ASEAN and a Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone in Southeast Asia"]

[Text] What is meant in this matter is turning the vast Southeast Asian region into a nuclear weapons-free zone. The idea of establishing such a zone, which originated fyom Indonesia, has gained the support of its ASEAN partners. It should be noted here that the regional association includes Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Brunei Darussalam in addition to Indonesia. At the recent summit in Manila, the ASEAN countries stated in a declaration that turning Southeast Asia into a nuclear weapons-free zone would represent the region's contribution to a general and mandatory disarmament.

However, the Manila summit did not produce practical steps for drafting the relevant treaty. Obviously, this is not free from the hidden opposition of the United States because a nonnuclear status for the region will pose an obstacle for the Pentagon in using the huge U.S. bases in the Philippines. The negative attitude of the U.S. Government toward the idea of establishing a nuclear weapons-free zone in Southeast Asia as in other parts of the world has become a public secret. It is blatantly stated in Washington that the establishment of such zones is incompatible with Washington's global interests or, in

other words, with the policy of interference in the affairs of independent countries—a policy with a nuclear intimidation as its basis, while bases and ships carrying nuclear weapons are a means to impose the U.S.' will on other peoples.

Nevertheless, the ASEAN countries do not intend to renounce their proposals, the realization of which is linked to the changing situation in the region which, as underlined in Manila, will turn for the better after the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

ASEAN Efforts on Nonnuclear Zone Welcomed

OW211325 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The ASEAN countries' firm idea of turning Southeast Asia into a nonnuclear zone was once again expressed at the recent meeting of leaders of those countries in Manila. A report summing up the meeting noted that the establishment of a nonnuclear zone in Southeast Asia would be an important step in turning Southeast Asia into a region of peace, freedom, and neutrality and that they must work harder to achieve this goal. In this connection, station Observer Alekseyev has the following comment:

The Soviet people welcome this proposal. General Secretary of the CPSU Gorbachev emphatically pointed out in his letter to Philippine President Aquino, who is also chairman of of the Manila conference: The Soviet side has repeatedly expressed its support to efforts by ASEAN and other countries in Southeast Asia to turn Southeast Asia into a nonnuclear zone.

I also wish to point out that the People's Republic of China is also taking a constructive stand on this matter. In other words, there are already two nuclear powers which support the proposition of turning Southeast Asia into a nonnuclear zone.

This proposition was put forward in the interest of peace. What are the prospects of realizing this proposition? The ASEAN countries are determined to realize this proposition, and the results of the Manila conference proved their determination. I am convinced that this is a firm assurance for efforts for the realization of this proposition.

The entire international situation has been improving. We face the prospect of possible total destruction of all nuclear weapons, and this will undoubtedly benefit all sides. The participants of the ASEAN summit in Manila have noticed this important prospect. They hold that the INF Treaty signed recently by the Soviet Union and the United States is an important step in realizing disarmament. The treaty will provide a new motive force to the ASEAN countries in their efforts to establish a nonnuclear zone in Southeast Asia.

I also wish to call your attention to the fact that countries in Indochina fully support this proposition. Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have repeatedly stated that they are willing to cooperate with the ASEAN countries in striving to realize this proposition.

Thai 'Provocations' Against Cambodia Noted

LD191318 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Phnom Penh December 19 TASS—The Thai military continues crude armed provocations on the border with People's Kampuchea. The SPK agency reports that in the period between December 5 and 11 Thai artillery subjected to massive shelling the frontier Kampuchean provinces of Siem Reap and Poursat. In the same period Thai warplanes violated Kampuchean airspace 10 times.

Units of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army put out of action 144 terrorists who tried to infiltrate into Kampuchea from Thailand to commit saboteur acts. Great quantities of arms and ammunition were captured.

PRK Responds to Thai Troop Withdrawal

PM211119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Positive Answer"]

[Text] Phnom Penh, 14 Dec—The PRK Defense Ministry welcomes Thailand's decision to withdraw a considerable proportion of its troops from the border with the PRK, an SPK [Agence de Presse du Kampuchea] report published here says.

People's Cambodia, the report points out, expresses the hope that measures to stop the illegal return to the PRK of Cambodians who are now in refugee camps on Thai territory will follow in the wake of this act of goodwill. The PRK Government has a positive attitude toward Cambodians' return to their homeland and thinks that the refugee camps must be moved from the border into the heart of Thailand and that the civilians in them should be separated from the armed groupings in order to regularize this process. These measures would help to stop attempts to use Thai territory to organize attacks by reactionary forces on the PRK.

The PRK Defense Ministry also announces that, by agreement between the Cambodian Government and the command of the military contingent of Vietnamese volunteers in the PRK, it has been decided to withdraw Vietnamese units from the border with Thailand, with

the exception of some regions where attempts to infiltrate Cambodia to carry out subversion and acts of sabotage are continuing. At the same time the PRK Government confirms its proposal on the creation of an internationally monitored security zone along the Cambodian-Thai border.

Hanoi, 14 Dec—The SRV Foreign Ministry fully supports the PRK Defense Ministry statement and considers it a positive response from the Cambodian side to Thailand's act of goodwill, a VNA report published here says.

The measures announced by the PRK are an important step designed to reduce tension on the Cambodian-Thai border and they help the quest for ways toward a political solution to the Cambodian problem and the establishment of peace and stability in Southeast Asia in the interests of all countries in the region.

The SRV Foreign Ministry for its part reaffirms the proposal to conclude a Vietnamese-Thai nonaggression treaty and states its readiness to hold a meeting between the Vietnamese and Thai foreign ministers to exchange opinions on questions of mutual interest.

Near East & South Asia

Jordan's King Husayn Arrives for Moscow Visit

Met By Gromyko, Shevardnadze

PM221039 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Official Visit"]

[Text] King Husayn ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan arrived in Moscow 21 December for a brief official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Soviet Government.

At Vnukovo airport, King Husayn and Queen Nur were greeted at the aircraft ramp by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and his wife, and E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

P.G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; USSR ministers A.N. Volkov and V.G. Zakharov; USSR first deputy ministers Yu. M. Vorontsov and P.G. Lushev; A.I. Kachanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; A.I. Zinchuk, USSR ambassador to Jordan; and other officials were in the welcoming party.

Jordanian Ambassador to the USSR Falih al-Tawil and the heads of a number of Arab countries' diplomatic missions in the USSR were also in the party.

The Jordanian and Soviet state flags were flying at the airport and an honor guard made up of three branches of the USSR Armed Forces—the Ground Forces, Air Force, and Navy—had been drawn up on the tarmac. A band played the national anthems.

A.A. Gromyko and King Husayn inspected the Soviet troops.

The welcoming ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The streets and squares on the route to the Kremlin taken by the motorcade with its motorcycle escort were hung with Jordanian and USSR state flags and banners inscribed with words of welcome in Arabic and Russian.

Husayn, Gromyko Begin Talks

JN212015 Amman Television Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Excerpts] His Majesty King Husayn and Her Majesty Queen Nur today began an official visit to the Soviet Union lasting several days. Our correspondent Ibrahim Shahazadah dispatched the following report from the Soviet capital:

[Begin Shahzadah recording] His Majesty King Husayn's visit to Moscow is the first by his majesty to a friendly country after the Amman summit—the summit of reconciliation and accord. His majesty is also the first leader to be received by the Soviet leadership after the Washington summit between M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan. [passage omitted]

The official talks between the Jordanian side headed by His Majesty King Husayn and the Soviet side headed by Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, began at the Yekaterinskiy Hall in the Kremlin at 1730 today. The talks were attended on the Jordanian side by His Highness Prince 'Abdallah ibn al-Husayn; Prime Minister Zayd al-Rifa'i; Royal Hashemite Court Chief Marwan al-Qasim; Army Commander Staff Marshal Al-Sharif Zayd ibn Shakir; Foreign Minsiter Tahir al-Masri; Jordanian Ambassador to the USSR Falih al-Tawil; the assistant chief of staff or planning and organization; the commander of the Royal Jordanian Air Force; and the inspector general of the Air Force. It was attended on the Soviet side by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze; Defense Minsiter Yazov; assistants to the prime minister [title as heard] Dumachev, Kamyshov, and Talyzin; Foreign Trade Minsiter Aristov; Katushev, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; Polyakov, chief of the Middle East and African countries Administration at the Soviet Foreign Ministry; the Soviet ambassador to Jordan; and a number of Gromyko's assistants. The talks centered on relations

between the two friendly countries and international issues, foremost of which are the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Arabian Gulf war. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Nuclear Arms, Mideast Discussed

LD212127 Moscow TASS in English 1954 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—Talks between member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and King Husayn ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan opened in the Kremlin today. King Husayn arrived in the Soviet Union for an official visit.

The discussion concentrated on crucial problems of the present—removal of nuclear menace, elimination of various kinds of weapons of mass destruction, consolidation of comprehensive security, the ways to solve problems connected with regional seats of tension, above all in the Middle East, including the Iran-Iraq war.

Andrey Gromyko emphasized that as a result of the talks between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, a truly historic step has been taken on the road to disarmament and ridding humanity of the threat of nuclear holocaust.

On his part, King Husayn pointed to the exceptional importance of the Soviet-American summit which promoted an overall improvement of the international climate.

Both sides expressed the confidence that the results of the Soviet-American meeting in Washington open new horizons for cooperation of all countries, large and small.

Both sides are united in the view that the edifice of peace cannot be durable as long as the fires of regional conflicts are smouldering or raging. One of the most dangerous such conflicts is the Middle Eastern one, which the participants in the talks will yet discuss.

The king of Jordan said that the Soviet Union, advancing peaceful foreign policy initiatives, plays an important role in ridding humanity of the horrors of nuclear war. He spoke highly of the Soviet Union's unshakable stand in defence of lofty principles and values which are cherished by all people on earth.

The king of Jordan told the Soviet side about how the problems of the Middle East (?and) of ending the Iran-Iraq war had been discussed at the Arab countries' summit in Amman and about the documents adopted there.

The talks will be continued.

Reiterates 'Unified' Stand

JN220806 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow—His Majesty King Husayn will meet with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow today.

Official talks between the Jordanian side headed by His Majesty King Husayn and the Soviet side headed by Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, began at the Kremlin yesterday evening. During the talks, His Majesty King Husayn expressed satisfaction over the treaty signed by the Soviet Union and the United States on scrapping nuclear missiles during Soviet leader Gorbachev's recent visit to the United States. His majesty briefed the Soviet side on the resolutions of the historic Amman summit and the Arab leaders' agreement at this summit on a unified Arab stand to tackle all regional issues. He reiterated that the phase of putting the Amman summit resolutions into effect has just begun.

The talks dealt with bilateral relations between the two friendly states and international issues of common interest to both states, foremost among which are the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Iraqi-Iran war, and the situation in the Arabian Gulf region.

Honored at Dinner

LD212229 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A dinner was given today in the Great Kremlin Palace on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Government in honor of King Husayn ibn Talal of Jordan and Queen Nur. Together with the Jordanian king were the officials accompanying him on his trip. Present from the Soviet side were Comrades Gromyko and his wife; Ryzhkov and his wife; Comrades Shevardnadze, Demichev, Talyzin, Yazov, Dobrynin, Razumovskiy, and other officials.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and Husayn ibn Talal exchanged speeches which were received with applause. The text of the speeches will be published in the press. The dinner passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Husayn Dinner Speech

JN220819 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 2105 GMT 21 Dec 87

["Text" of speech by Jordan's King Husayn ibn Talal at a dinner hosted by Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Andrey Gromyko in Moscow on 21 December—read by announcer]

[Text] Your Excellency Esteemed Chairman, Madame Gromyko, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is a great pleasure for me to be with you here this evening. Queen Nur and

the accompanying delegation join me in expressing our joy over this occasion, which enables us to express our appreciation and respect for you and for your statesmanship, which is illustrated by the record of your great accomplishments and continuous work for the causes of peace, liberation, and cooperation among nations. It is my pleasure also to express our thanks for the kind hospitality accorded to us since our arrival in your great country and beautiful capital. It pleases me to seize this opportunity to convey to your excellency and the friendly Government and people of the USSR my greetings and the love of the Government and people of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as well as their aspirations for further ties of cooperation for the well-being of our two countries and the common interests of our two peoples.

Your Excellency Chairman, my visit to you today comes only a few weeks after your celebration of the 70th anniversary of your revolution, which has raised your country to the notable place it now occupies in our world. You should feel proud that during this short period of time you have made internal and external achievements that have turned your country into a major power with a direct influence on the course of events in the international sphere and a leading role in determining the future of mankind. We are also following with great admiration the restructuring process you have begun in order to gain further achievements for your country and people under the slogans "Glasnost" and "Perestroyka." We cannot but express our profound appreciation that despite your main preoccupations you have not overlooked your responsibilities toward world peace and security. You have always been foremost in presenting constructive plans and proposals for nuclear disarmament as an essential first step for building human civilization and preserving the existence and security of mankind. It pleases me to express in my own name and also in the name of the Government and people of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan our congratulations to you on your success in signing the Treaty on Eliminating Medium and Short-Range Nuclear Missiles with the United States on 8 December. All the nations of the world have every right to rejoice this essential first step that will definitely open the way for other, subsequent steps that will remove the nuclear armament nightmare gripping our world, enabling all efforts and resources to be devoted to the urgent process of economic and social development in a world free of nuclear terror, and in which nations enjoy security and peoples enjoy freedom.

Your Excellency Chairman, your country set the best example in World War II in the defense of the homeland against Nazi aggression. Your people made huge human and material sacrifices to achieve this noble objective. Your heroism has also provided an example to all world peoples who struggle to get rid of foreign domination and achieve the national independence of their states and the freedom of their social and political systems. You have always been a support for the causes of liberation and a source of help and inspiration to all those who sought to liberate themselves from tyranny and colonialism, and to live honorably and freely. We have felt this in particular through your firm and decisive support for our Arab nation's just cause.

You have stood at the side of right, justice ,and international legitimacy through your support for Arab rights in the Palestine question and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our meeting with you was a principled one based on rejecting aggression and injustice, on our belief in peoples' freedom and in settling conflicts between states through peaceful means. Here lies our identical viewpoints on the issue and the useful means to settle it. Within this framework also falls our call for holding an international conference for peace in the Middle East to be attended by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, in addition to all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, to reach the necessary means to implement UN Security Council Resolution 338. This resolution confirms the implementation of Resolution 242, that stipulates, among other things, as you know, the nonacquisition of others' territory by force, and the Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied in the June war of 1967 in accordance with the land for peace equation. Since the Palestinian people's territory and issue is the crux of the Arab-Israeli conflict, all aspects of the Palestine question should be settled in order to achieve a just and comprehensive peace that is acceptable to present and future generations.

During their summit in Amman last month, the Arab leaders confirmed their sincere Arab approach toward achieving a just peace in accordance with international legitimacy, and toward holding the international conference as the only means to achieve the aspired peace. We strongly hope that the USSR, which holds the same opinion on the international conference, will exert, as in the past, every possible effort to guarantee the success of this collective Arab approach, or in fact the world approach which seeks to achieve peace and justice. We are certain that your effective role will be essential and necessary to acheive this noble objective in our region which is vitally important to world security and peace. As you know, I have arrived in your country, leaving behind me in the region the Palestinian people's uprising in the occupied territory against the occupation and its authorities. The strange thing is that the Israeli leadership is still deluding itself by claiming that this uprising is the work of extremist outside parties. This uprising is only natural, and is the reaction of the Palestinian people who have been suffering from occupation for 20 years. Therefore, the Israeli leadership must realize that its interpretation of events harms the peace process and deceives the Israeli people themselves.

Your Excellency Chairman, the second issue the Arab leaders focused on and attached great importance to is the Iraq-Iran war, which the Iranian regime insists on continuing against fraternal Iraq's people and territory. As you know, this war has entered its 8th year and

claimed huge human and material losses; in addition, it endangers stability and security in the region. The Iranian Government not only rejected all the region and international efforts to achieve peace and justice, but it also expanded its aggression, threats, and acts of sabotage to include the state of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

Fraternal Iraq has responded favorably to all peace overtures that sought to end fighting and bring about peace. It has cooperated positively with all peace initiatives launched by the ICO, the Nonaligned Movement, and the United Nations—the latest of which resulted in the UN Security Council's unanimous adoption of international Resolution No 598 issued on 20 July 1987. You had a prominent role in formulating and issuing the said resolution.

Iraq has responded favorably to this resolution which represents the international will. It acceptged it, and pledged to implement it in its entirity and in accordance with the sequence of its articles. Although a long time has elapsed since this resolution was adopted and despite the various missions undertaken by the UN secretary general with the Iranian Government, the latter has remained adamant in its rejection of the international will and in its defiance of peace efforts. It has also announced, through its leaders, that it will continue this hostile and destructive war that jeopardizes not only regional stability, but also world security and peace.

Taking into account the terrible dangers posed by the Iranian regime's aggressiveness, we beleive the international community is required to complement its praiseworthy effort, represented by UN Security Council Resolution 598, and work toward pushing the Iranian regime to accept its provisions.

Your gigantic sacrifices during World War II have proved that resisting evil and aggression is possible by decisively confronting them and not appeasing them. We beleive that the international community must draw the proper conclusions from this lesson. At their summit in Amman, Arab nation's leaders unanimously stressed the need to end the war and condemned the Iranian regime's aggressiveness. They also denounced Iran's continued occupation of some Iraqi territories, its rejection of UN Security council 598, and its failure to pledge to implement it. The also called on the UN Security Council to use the authorities vested in it by the UN Charter to work unhesitatingly to implement Resolution 598 in its entirity, as an integrated indivisible whole, in letter and spirit, and in accordance with the sequences of its operative paragraphs.

Because I was honored by my brothers the Arab leaders to chair their summit, and in implementation of the mission that they assigned to me regarding following up the implementation of its resolutions, including the resolution on the Iraq-Iran war, I have great hopes that your friendly country will use its effective international influence and weight to implement the resolution and persuade Iran to yield to the international will and legitimacy. This hope of ours emanates from your well-known commitment to the principles of bringing about peace, to the ways to make it a reality, and to the distinction that you draw between the enemies and supporters of peace. This hope of ours is also based on your firm stand toward the Israeli aggressive behavior which is very similar to the Iranian behavior. Our hopes are also based on our faith in your eagerness to embody the spirit reflected by the signing a few days ago of the Treaty to Eliminate Medium- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles. The lesson learned from this treaty, Your Excellency, is the inevitability of seeing man on this small planet earth learn to coexist with his brother, regardless of the disparity beween state systems, sentiments of affection and admiration, or those of intolerance and malice, because peace will remain the higher objective of all mankind.

The Arab nation looks forward to the realization of a peaceful settlement between Iraq and Iran—a settlement that restores security and stability to the Gulf, away from international rivalry, and paves the way for forging ties of cooperation and good-neighborliness between Iran and its neighboring Arab states. The Arab nation would like to see your friendly country help it realize this through using its influence in various fields, especially within the framework of the UN Security Council which issued Resolution 598.

Your Excellency Chairman, within the framework of the relations of amity and friendship that bind us with you, and our common belief in the right of all peoples to determine their own destinies in complete freedom, I would like to recall the Arab and Islamic world's deep anxiety concerning the situation in Afghanistan. We were pleased by the CPSU general secretary's recent statements concerning your country's intention to withdraw its forces within a period of not more than 12 months. We also hope that you will soon be able to remove the obstacles preventing a broad-based national reconciliation that will restore security and stability of Afghanistan so it can resume the march of development and reconstruction as a neutral country as well as a friend and neighbor to the USSR. We are fully confident that you will make an effective and influential contribution toward crystallizing this deserving cause.

It pleases me that during my previous visits to the USSR an understanding was always shown to our causes and concerns. I have always been satisfied with your continuous support for us. With the same spirit, I am looking forward to exchanging views with you in the interest of the USSR and the entire Arab world. I am also satisfied with the firm relations between our countries and peoples. We are pleased because these relations are established on entrenched bases of mutual respect and joint interests, and constitute an example of sincere cooperation between states with different political, economic, and social systems. Since signing the cultural and scientific cooperation agreement between our countries in

1967, and the economic cooperation protocol in 1969, our relations have been witnessing a growing development in our joint interests. We are looking forward to benefiting from your advanced experience in all fields.

We are sure that the firm stands of your friendly country supporting the Arab nation's just cause will urge us to exert continuous efforts and serious action to promote bilateral cooperation in all fields between the Arab world and the USSR.

I reiterate my thanks and apprecaition for allowing me this opportunity to meet with you and with your colleagues in the Soviet leadership and to visit your great country. I hope you will allow me, Queen Nur, and the Jordanian Government and people to welcome you and your wife in Amman to express to you our affection and appreciation for you and your friendly people. On the threshold of the new year, I am pleased to extend to you, your wife, and the friendly people our heartfelt congratulations and sincere wishes, asking God to render it a year of prosperity, peace, and achievements. I wish you well year after year. It also pleases me to call on the esteemed audience to share with me and Queen Nur in standing to greet His Excellency Chairman Andrey Gromyko, Mrs Gromyko, and the Jordanian-Soviet friendship. May God's peace and blessings be upon you.

Gromyko Reply to Husayn

PM211401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report of the 21 December dinner speech of Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, given on behalf of Jordan's King Husayn, under the headline: "Based on Principles of Mutual Respect"]

[Text] It gives us pleasure to cordially welcome our high-ranking guest, King Husayn of Jordan, who has arrived in the USSR on an official visit. Likewise, we are pleased to see Queen Nur here at the Moscow Kremlin.

Firm relations, based on the principles of mutual respect and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, have long since developed between our countries.

For us Soviet people, Jordan is an integral part of the Arab world, a land of age-old traditions, an original culture. The dwelling places, palaces and temples of Petra—the capital of one of the most ancient states which is rightfully regarded as one of the miraculous architectural creations of man, cut in stone in the rocks—are unique.

Yes, it is not for nothing that Jordan is called "a museum under the sky." However, it is not just the need to preserve cultural monuments that is being voiced in our time. Peoples are vocal indeed in their demand to save primarily man's very life on earth.

The times in which we live are not ordinary. Quite recently a Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed during the visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The results of this trip and its repercussions in the world show that the cherished goal of mankind, that of preventing the threat of nuclear war, has become more tangible. Even those who continue to oppose nuclear disarmament find it difficult to pass this off as a mirage, as an impossible dream. It is clear to the whole world that the achievement of this goal, if a stance based on reason is adopted, now depends only upon the scale of the efforts that are made.

Long ago it became obvious that the arms race is movement toward bottomless precipice. And if one is to use a comparison that is linked with your own country, esteemed guests, then the arms race is a caravan in the desert making its way toward a dead sea that kills all living things.

The Soviet-U.S. treaty eliminating the missiles of two classes has been the first step in the reverse direction—toward the removal of the threat of disaster toward the preservation of life.

We never tire of repeating that our Leninist policy is a policy of peace, and the Soviet Union, together with its allies and with all states that are in favor of the development of friendly links, is building an edifice of peace. But this will not be a strong building if the structure that bears it, security, remains unreliable.

This truth has become an axiom in the nuclear age. This is why the task of invigorating collective efforts for the removal of military danger spots was stressed at the 27th CPSU Congress. This concerns the Near East, perhaps, first and foremost. A grave conflict has been bleeding in this region for four decades now. Year after year there occurs a dangerous accumulation of new strifes. More knots of contradiction begin to tie. An arms race unprecedented in its burden has developed in the region. There is in evidence the involvement, and ever wider involvement, of external forces. They are trying to use the situation for their own narrow ends. As a result there is chronic military and political instability, senseless human losses, ruined cities and villages, and economic collapse. All of this engenders an atmosphere of dangerous tension, a feeling of uncertainty about tomorrow for the people living there.

It is essential to settle the Near East conflict. This is the order of the day. The trampling of the legitimate interests of peoples and the norms of international law is an unwise path. The peoples will never be reconciled while their rights are ignored. The courageous resistance the Palestinian people are currently offeing to the Israeli occupiers is graphic proof of the total lack of future for

the policy of the "iron fist" which the Israelis are conducting there. A resolute and bold turnabout toward a collective quest for an honorable and just peace is needed.

The Soviet Union is far from indifferent to the fate of the peoples of the Near East. This region of the world is a border region for our country, and the imflammation of the military and political situation here cannot fail to affect our security and also the security of our friends and allies. We have long been linked with the Near East by historical, political, economic and cultural interests.

We can understand that other countries also have such interests, but this does not at all mean that anyone from outside should have pretensions to the role of the arbiter of fate in the region and impose their own norms and yardsticks on peoples by force.

At the moment the idea of a Near East peace conference is at the focus of international attention. It is a good thing that it is gathering strength and weight. Even those who quite recently wished to hear nothing about it are beginning today to consider and discuss the possibilities for it.

There are also those quarters that are trying to surround the convening of the conference with fabricated preliminary conditions and various stipulations. They are trying to turn to their own advantage the broad accord that is forming in favor of the conference. One gains the impression certain quarters in the United States and Israel wish to deflect once again the search for a Near East settlement into the potholed rut of separate deals, which are far from the aims of establishing a lasting peace in the region.

The task of the conference is to achieve genuine peace in the Near East. It is to work out solutions and decisions on all aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, including a worthy [dostoynyy] solution of the Palestinian problem. The Soviet Union's position on the Palestinian issue is well-known. The fundamental thing in the work of the conference should be respect for the independence of every state, and the right of any people to choose independently its path of development in conditions of security.

To pave the way for a worthwhile international conference—that is the task at the moment. The Soviet Union is inclined toward constructive work on this problem both in the UN Security Council and in contacts with all interested parties, including the PLO and Israel.

The flames of the war between Iran and Iraq have been burning for 8 years now. The list of its victims and destruction is growing. Clearing the atmosphere and removing the accumulated mutual enmity is possible only through political efforts; moreover, it is necessary to act in a sober and balanced manner, using the UN mechanism for these purposes.

The USSR's principled position advocating that the war between Iran and Iraq ought to be halted remains unchanged. UN Security Council Resolution 598 represents here a sensible and balanced foundation for an equitable settlement.

Of course, the path toward halting the war is fraught with difficulties. It is not sufficient for Iraq alone to be ready for a political settlement. The world community is within its rights to expect practical steps toward peace from Iran too. Naturally, it would be preferable for the sides themselves to sit down at the negotiating table. As Eastern wisdom would have it: "Good-neighborliness arises from good thoughts." In this case the need to resort to other measures, provided for in the UN charter, would no longer apply.

The buildup of an armada of warships of the United States and its NATO allies in the Persian Gulf merely complicates the peaceful settlement of the Iran-Iraq war. Such a conclusion is fully confirmed by the facts of the tense situation in the Gulf.

The Soviet Union has spoken in favor of the withdrawal of all ships of non-Gulf states from this region; it insists on this. If this reallly is a matter of ensuring freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf, this function can be placed on UN naval forces specially formed for these purposes. Their establishment would be in the interests of all countries.

Talking about the burning problems of the Near East I would also like to mention Arab solidarity as well. Experience suggests that the voice of the Arabs is more authoritative when the gaps in their ranks are fewer. A detailed conversation on this topic took place at the recent meeting of the heads of Arab states in the Jordanian capital, Amman. This is good.

Soviet people have a sincere and friendly attitude toward the Jordanian people. We note with satisfaction that already almost 25 years have passed since diplomatic links were established between the Soviet Union and Jordan. In this time a broad range of agreements in the sphere of economic, scientific and technical and cultural cooperation has been concluded, and they are all being fulfilled. The practice of carrying out a mutual exchange of opinions on the most important matters relating to the situation in the Near East is also being maintained.

The talks currently taking place in Moscow are a new step in this direction. Tomorrow you are going to meet Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. We are confident that that conversation will give a considerable impetus to Soviet-Jordanian cooperation and to bringing nearer the long awaited stable peace for all peoples of the Near East.

Our sincere desire for peace is also closely linked with those colossal tasks that we have set ourselves in work within the country on the deep restructuring of all

aspects of our life. Resolutely removing manifestations of stagnation and conservatism, the Soviet people are opening the doors even more widely to socialism and democracy.

On behalf of the Soviet people who are engaged in creative labor we express kind sentiments toward our guests.

I would like to end my speech with a toast in honor of the head of the Jordanian state and his wife, in honor of all the Jordanian visitors.

May our friendship gain strength, may cooperation between our countries develop!

Husayn Meets Gorbachev

LD220904 Moscow TASS in English 0832 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting in the Kremlin today with King Husayn ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

King Husayn arrived in the Soviet Union Monday on a brief official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the USSR and the Soviet Government.

USSR Envoy Sytenko Meets Libya's Jallud

LD220755 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Tripoli, 22 December (TASS)—'Abd al-Salam Jallud, member of the revolutionary leadership of the Libyan Jamahiriyah, yesterday received M.D. Sytenko, special envoy of the Soviet leadership, who informed him in detail of the course and outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. In response to the interest shown on the Libyan side, the principled position of the Soviet-Union on regional conflicts was also set out. On behalf of the revolutionary Libyan leadership, Jallud thanked the Soviet leadership for information on these important questions. During the conversation certain questions of bilateral relations were also touched upon.

Akhromeyev Confers With Indian Officials

LD211458 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Delhi, 21 Dec (TASS)—Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev arrived in the Indian capital today. He has had meetings with Defense Minister Krishna Chandra Pant; Shivraj Patil, minister of state for Defense Production and Military Supplies; Air Force Marshal Denis Anthony La Fontaine, chief of the Air Force Staff; and the chiefs of staff of the Army and Navy of the Republic of India. Vasiliy Rykov, ambassador of the USSR to India, took part in the conversations.

The Soviet military leader laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Pakistan Runs Afghan Rebel's Training Centers

LD212200 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Recently, in the mass information media of Afghanistan there has been an increase in the number of reports expressing anxiety about the situation in the regions bordering Pakistan. Our correspondent in Kabul Aleksandr Shkirando reports:

[Shkirando] The reports point out that while on the entire territory of Afghanistan urgent steps are being taken to speed up the process of national reconciliation, the enemies of the Afghan people are attempting to impede by any means possible the successful realization of this process. A special role in these anti-Afghan actions is played by Pakistan, on whose territory the headquarters of the seven-group [word indistinct] alliance has found a refuge. Around 100 special training centers are functioning there for the preparation of Afghan extremists to conduct war against the present government of the Republic of Afghanistan and a limited contingent of Soviet troops.

I must say that centers such as these on Pakistani territory have been around for more than a year, and they have trained more than 100 professional assassins among a number of the Afghan counterrevolutionaries. It is also appropriate to mention that in these centers, apart from Pakistani military specialists, the rebels get military training from foreign advisors. Recently, for example, it was noted at the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Afghanistan that in fairly close proximity to the Province of Nangarhar 34 training centers are operating on Pakistani territory, where 330 foreign advisors are conducting the military training of Afghan extremists, including 109 advisors from the United States of America, and 86 from Pakistan.

In recent times Pakistan has resorted more than once to using long-range guns and antiaircraft missile complexes against the Afghan districts along the border. A few days ago, ground-to-ground class missiles were fired at the Afghan border districts of Takhar and (Pochergam) and the district of Pachin. The Pakistani military specialists also are participating actively in the ideological brainwashing of the Afghan tribes living along the border. These are just some of the examples of the open and direct external interference in the affairs of independent and sovereign Afghanistan.

Pakistanis Said To Participate in Afghan Combat

LD211925 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Islamabad December 21 TASS—More than one thousand Pakistanis directly participate in combat actions against the Afghan Government, the leader of a large bandit group has said.

The Lahore-based newspaper NATION today quoted Hamidullah Niyazi [name as received] as telling a press conference in Lahore that one of his deputies was a Pakistani, (Mian Attaullah), [name as received] who headed the organisation Allah-o-Akbar Jihad.

This organisation groups all Pakistanis fighting on the side of the so-called Mujahedins, Afghan counter-revolutionaries.

According to Niyazi, the counter-revolutionaries' struggle would have been impossible without the Pakistanis' support.

East Europe

Warsaw Meeting of Pact Information Group 16 Dec

LD161411 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] A routine session of the Multilateral Group of Current and Mutual Information [Gruppa Tekushchey i Vzaimnoy Informatsii v sostave predstabiteley gosudarstv-uchastnikov Varshavskog Dogovora], comprising representatives of the Warsaw Pact member states, took place in Warsaw on 15 and 16 December.

The session exchanged information and views on some topical international problems.

PPR Deputy Foreign Minister Jaroszek, general secretary of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states, had a meeting with the session's participants.

Honecker Gives Concluding Speech at SED Plenum

PM221629 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "E. Honecker's Speech"]

[Text] Berlin, 17 Dec—E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, delivered the concluding speech at the SED Central Committee plenum held here. He pointed out that the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate and Shorter-Range Missiles and the projected 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms, strengthening of the ABM Treaty, and considerable reduction in armed forces and conventional arms indicate the path to a world free from nuclear weapons.

The GDR leader called for the further activation of the struggle for detente and disarmament. We will continue to proceed from the premise that there is no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems, and therefore confrontation must be replaced by cooperation based on a broad foundation. This also applies to the GDR's relations with the FRG.

E. Honecker dwelt on questions of the GDR's socioeconomic development. During the period from 1980 through 1987, he said, national income in our country increased from 193.5 billion marks to more than 261 billion marks. This amounts to an average annual increase of 4.4%. Some 98% of this increase was secured through higher labor productivity. During the eighties alone more than 4 million citizens in the Republic have improved their housing conditions.

PZPR Resolution Fully Supports INF Treaty

LD182153 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Warsaw December 18 TASS—The Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party has expressed full support for the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. This document accords with the hopes of the European peoples and peaceful aspirations of the whole of mankind, says a resolution of the recent plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee, which has been published here. That document is the first breakthrough step on the road to efficient disarmament, to bringing nearer realization of the concept of ridding the world of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century, which was put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

For the Polish people peaceful coexistence, development of international cooperation, creation of the system of universal security stem from the historical experience and accord with the country's state interests.

The Polish United Workers Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic in the past repeatedly put forward important peace initiatives. Pursuing this course and putting into life decisions of the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers Party, the party will continue making a concrete contribution to the new political thinking being formed by the socialist community. The Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party expresses confidence that the plan of reducing armaments and building up confidence in Central Europe, advanced by first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party Wojciech Jaruzelski, fully meets this goal.

TRYBUNA LUDU Editor on Referendum Results

PM181427 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Article by J. Majka, chief editor of TRYBUNA LUDU: "On the Road of Reforms"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Warsaw, Dec—A nationwide referendum on the question of reforms in the economy and the sociopolitical sphere has been held in Poland. In letters to PRAVDA readers are inquiring about its results and the

tasks being tackled by the PZPR and the Polish Government at the current stage. Jerzy Majka, member of the PZPR Central Committee and chief editor of TRYBUNA LUDU, writes on this subject at our request.

During the time which has elapsed since the referendum interest in its results both in Poland and abroad has not subsided.

The progress and results of the referendum have been assessed by the Polish Sejm, which adopted a corresponding decision. Earlier, immediately after the referendum, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo acquainted itself with the information on the results of the referendum, noting that the final analysis of the results of the ballot will be made at the next PZPR Central Committee plenum scheduled for later this month. Positive assessments of the referendum were made by the Presidium of the Main Committee of the United Peasant Party, the Central Committee of the Democratic Party, and the Executive Committee of the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth.

Unquestionably, the referendum was an important event in the life of the country; more than two-thirds of the citizens entitled to vote took part in it. This indicates their acceptance of this democratic form of expressing their opinion on key questions of the Republic's economic and sociopolitical development.

The results of the referendum should be viewed from two angles. The first focuses on facts expressed above all in figures. The second interprets these facts from the viewpoint of constitutional law.

More than two-thirds of the citizens who took part in the referendum answered "yes" to the two questions put to the vote in the referendum. Thus, the politically active section of society expressed itself in favor of the radical reforms designed to accelerate the restoration of the economy and the development of democracy and self-management. This is a result that many countries which use this form for the expression of public opinion might envy.

At the same time—and here we come to the constitutional law aspect of the results—the Sejm did not obtain, in the legal sense, a legally valid answer. The number who voted "in favor" did not constitute the majority required by law, i.e. 50% of all those entitled to vote. Thus society did not take a legally enforceable decision in respect of the proposed program. At the same time it did not reject this program. Those who voted "no" are a minority. As a result of the referendum the Polish parliament—the Sejm—obtained an objective view of the population's attitude toward the proposed reforms. This has enabled leading state organs to modify the reform program in accordance with the people's will. It is worth noting this fact since it testifies to the new quality of a democratic solution of key state problems.

The preparations for the referendum have, without any doubt, produced a great political stir in the country. The society's lack of confidence in the feasibility of a successful implementation of the reforms proclaimed by the 10th PZPR Congress, which was evident as recently as September, has been largely removed. It has been determined that more than 6 million people took part in the meetings and gatherings held prior to the referendum. A lively, at times heated, but at the same time open and sincere discussion took place. People have gained a better understanding of the very nature of the reform and the need for its implementation. The prereferendum campaign evolved into an unprecedented school of economic education.

The citizens' mass participation in the referendum testifies to a growing general responsibility felt for the fatherland. It once again exposed the false claim of the opponents of socialism that our society is characterized by passiveness, that people try to avoid dialogue with the authorities. At the same time it was a school of practical democracy. Many people experienced for the first time that they could say either "yes" or "no." It is possible to claim boldly that on 29 November this year democracy entered a new stage in Poland.

The results of the referendum confirmed that around 12 million people in Poland favor radical reforms. This is a powerful front, a powerful backing for transformations. Let us recall the recent past when the adventurists from the former "Solidarity," operating with much smaller numbers and lacking positive proof, claimed the right to a monopoly of the country's leadership.

The referendum represents an important political experience for the party, which has emerged as a champion of the reforms and seeks to increase the number of their supporters. The party work carried out prior to the referendum did a good service to the reinforcement and renewal of the party's links with the people.

While those who did not vote or voted "no" had various motives, one thing is certain. In the decisions taken by individual citizens society was guided by both an assessment of the submitted draft reforms and the attitude to present-day reality. Misgivings about a temporary deterioration of the material standard of life, the fear of the unknown, and doubts about the feasibility of a rapid improvement of the situation combined with a critical assessment of the hardships of daily life. Despite extensive efforts to explain the situation, we have still not managed to convince everyone. This task remains topical.

The opponents of socialism and stabilization in Poland failed to stage a boycott of the referendum just as, twice in the past, they failed to stage a boycott of the elections to people's councils and the Sejm.

At the same time they fully revealed themselves as masters of slander, claiming with strident confidence that the results of the referendum will be falsified. Once again they themselves have proved their entire activity is based on lies and falsehoods as the principles and constant practice of all antisocialist propaganda.

The party did not flirt with society in the campaign which preceded the referendum. It did not promise any miracles or castles in the air. It spoke the truth, a difficult and bitter truth at times. Therefore we are all the more pleased with the result of the referendum. A substantial section of society displayed civic activeness, expressed its opinion, gave its backing.

The party will not veer from the path of socialist renewals, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo has stated. The party hierarchy and organizations must act vigorously for the sake of resolute transformations and improvements in the economy and in social life and to increase their influence on the successful development and consolidation of socialist Poland.

The Polish Sejm also emphasized in its resolution "the indestructible will to proceed with the adopted economic reforms, the all-around democratization of social life, and the consolidation of the state." In submitting the proposals to improve the program for the second stage of the economic reform in the Sejm the government confirmed that all the general objectives of this program will be implemented. However, in accordance with the conclusions of the discussion that preceded the referendum and the results of the voting, the operation to change food prices will be spread over 3 years. The intentions concerning such important questions as housing construction, the population's provision with medicines and sanitary and disinfectant products, the peasants' provision with the means of production, and the elimination of red tape in state institutions will be formulated in more specific terms.

The public opinion expressed during the referendum has been received with the utmost responsibility. It was democracy and the course of reforms that triumphed 29 November.

Trade, Payment Protocol With Poland Signed

LD110937 Warsaw PAP in English 2231 GMT 10 Dec 87

[By PAP correspondent Slawomir Popowski]

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 10—As a result of trade negotiations which had been held, a protocol on Polish-Soviet trade turnover and bilateral payments for 1988 was signed here today.

The protocol envisages that overall turnover will grow by some 7 per cent next year and will amount to over 13 billion roubles.

Polish exports to the Soviet Union will be dominated by machine and plant (chiefly electronic calculating equipment), technological lines for various branches of industry, machine and plant for power, coal, chemical, textile, food, and building materials industries as well as ships and marine equipment. Also, overhaul and repair services will be rendered in the field of ship-building industry.

The most important items in Polish imports from the Soviet Union will be raw materials, primarily cride oil, large amounts of petrol, natural gas, as coking coal. Moreover, a considerable amount of electric energy, iron ores, ferroalloys, cotton and of other industrial materials will be delivered to Poland. As far as raw materials are concerned, those will be largest imported supplies to the Polish industry.

Poland will be also exporting coal, including power and coking coal, sulphur, sulphuric acid, calcined soda, paints and laquers, dyes as well as mill-rolled and other products.

Exchange of agricultural produce and foodstuffs will be carried out as well.

On their part, the Soviet side will supply such goods and products as: passenger cars, large quantities of refrigerators and washing mashines of different types, colour televisions sets, watches, sports and tourist equipment as well as cheese, canned fish, brandy, champaign and table wine.

On the Polish side, the protocol was signed by Minister for Foreign Economic Relations Wladyslaw Gwiazda, while on the Soviet side—Minister for Foreign Trade Boris Aristov.

After the protocol was signed, Minister Wladyslaw Gwiazda gave an interview to PAP, and said, in part:

The document signed provides for a number of new phenomena that accompany the favourably developing Polish-Soviet economic cooperation and goods exchange. Its contents include a practical implementation of the resolutions adopted on the level of party leadership and governments of the two countries.

The document ensures supplies of basic raw materials indispensable for the economies of our countries, and in main goods groups it is convergent with the provisions of the long-term 1986-1990 agreement.

Jakes Thanks Gorbachev for Congratulations

PM221229 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[CPCZ's Jakes message of thanks to Gorbachev]

[Text] To M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Dear Comrade Gorbachev,

I wholeheartedly thank you for your congratulations on my election as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

I am fully aware of the great responsibility placed in me by our our party's Central Committee. The 17th CPCZ Congress drew up a large-scale and complex program for further developing and consolidating socialism in our country and for speeding up socioeconomic development in inextricable union with the restructuring and democratization of all social life. This involves in many respects, and particularly in terms of their fundamentals, questions and tasks similar to those which all socialist countries are tackling in the light of their own conditions. The activity of the fraternal CPSU serves as a powerful stimulus and fruitful, inspiring example for them here. We are following its persistent efforts with ardent fellow-feeling and draw invaluable experience for our own work from them. We will do everything possible to ensure that the time-tested friendship and cooperation between our Communist Parties and countries will deepen still further.

I wish the CPSU Central Committee and you personally, dear Comrade Gorbachev, great success in carrying out the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, in restructuring and democratizing Soviet society, and in your tireless struggle for peace.

With Communist Greetings,

M. Jakes, General Secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

More on CPCZ Central Committee Plenary Meeting

Plenum Concludes 18 Dec

LD181754 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Prague December 18 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia came to a close here today. At the request of Gustav Husak it relieved him of the duties of general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Participants in the plenary meeting unanimously elected Milos Jakes, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Central Committee of the party, to the post of general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The plenary meeting heard and discussed a report on the consistent implementation of the course of the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia towards the acceleration of socio-economic development, comprehensive reorganization and the deepening of socialist democracy made by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the party.

The plenary meeting adopted a resolution on all the problems discussed.

A concluding speech was made by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the party.

Jakes Closing Report

PM211353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Historical Necessity: The CPCZ Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Prague, 18 Dec—The CPCZ Central Committee plenum ended here today. The report of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium "For the Consistent Implementation of the 17th CPCZ Congress Line of Accelerating Economic and Social Development, for Comprehensive Restructuring, for the Deepening of Socialist Democracy" was delivered at the plenum by M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

At previous plenums, the speaker said, decisions were taken on the restructuring of the economic mechanism, the main guidelines for the process of social restructuring were defined, and a range of proposals on deepening socialist democracy were approved. The center of gravity in the activity of Central Committee organs in the ensuing months shifted to the working out of these tasks, and a draft of the corresponding documents was submitted to the present plenum.

That is only the beginning of intensive work to implement the fundamental changes that must take place in the sphere of the economy, social development and culture, and party work. It is not a question of formal changes, but of steps on a major revolutionary scale, the most important changes since February 1948. Their implementation is a lengthy process in the course of which the decisions adopted must be tested in practice. It will be necessary to act purposefully and in an organized way, not to permit excessive slowness or marking time, but not to force the pace either. The difficulties we are encountering today in the process of intensification, in fulfilling the Eighth 5-Year Plan, only confirm the need for such an approach. The initiator and guarantor of the implementation of changes in accordance with the interests of the people and of socialist development is the Communist Party.

We regard restructuring as a historical necessity, we approach it in the spirit of the results of the working meeting of leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries belonging to CEMA in Moscow in November 1986, which emphasized the need to utilize a new theoretical, ideological, and political approach to the further development of the socialist society.

We assess highly the role of the pioneer and the tremendous international significance of the CPSU's work in elaborating the theory and practice of socialist building and renewing and creatively developing the Leninist concept of socialism at the present stage. The program of revolutionary restructuring and democratization of Soviet society that Soviet Communists are resolutely and vigorously pursuing in all spheres, including international relations, as we witnessed during the U.S. visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opens up new prospects for socialism's development and the growth of its prestige and magnetic force in the world.

In resolving questions of the comprehensive restructuring of our socialist society, the decisive role belongs to economic restructuring.

We proceed on the basis of the fundamental principles of socialism now in operation, social ownership of the means of production, the planned development of the economy, distribution according to the results of labor, and the leading role of the working class and its vanguard—the communist party. It was these principles that the right-wing opportunists and revisionists came out against in 1968. Today our adversaries dream that the restructuring of the economic mechanism and all public life may lead to a departure from the fundamental principles of socialism. They will not live to see that. We saw clearly, in the years of crisis, where deviations from the class positions of Marxism-Leninism lead, and we drew the appropriate conclusions.

The comprehensive restructuring of the economic mechanism means fundamental changes in the methods of management and planning in the national economy.

A decisive step is the objective review of wholesale and retail prices and the restructuring of the system of deductions and taxes. It is a question of the necessary conditions for the application of the principle of self-financing by enterprises, and the consistent elimination of undesirable subsidies and everything that encourages thriftlessness and makes it possible for enterprises that work poorly to remain afloat to the detriment of those that manage their affairs well.

Guided by the resolution on the restructuring of the economic mechanism, we will considerably reduce their management apparatus and the number of state management organs.

The full-scale introduction of the new economic mechanism will begin 1 January 1991, but in the near future it is necessary to draw up a program for the transition from the existing management system to the new principles of economic management, and to embark on its implementation without delay. It is necessary to make a realistic assessment of the conditions now prevailing in our economy. We must not expect a drastic improvement in the near future. That is the only way to prevent disappointment and a possible return to the administrative system of management.

The basic principles of the new economic mechanism, wide powers for the workers' collectives, and their responsibility for the results of economic management are contained in the draft law on the state enterprises, the draft law on agricultural cooperatives, and the draft law on production, consumer, and housing cooperatives.

The vast majority of citizens who took part in discussing these documents expressed full support for the CPCZ's policy and emphasized the necessity and importance of the restructuring of the economic mechanism and the democratization of all spheres of society's life.

A significant proportion of the comments touched on the party's leading role in the new conditions, first and foremost in the sphere of cadre work and party monitoring of the activity of the economic leadership and self-management organs. The participants in the discussion emphasized that the success of the restructuring depends on party leadership.

People's wide participation in the debate and their proposals and observations represent a true school of democracy, of the citizens' genuine interest in the further development of the socialist society.

An important step along the path to deepening and expanding socialist democracy is the measures to expand the rights of enterprises, the establishment of the principles of self-management in the labor collectives, and the appointment of leadership workers by election. It is a question of fundamental measures aimed at expanding democracy in a decisive sphere—the production sphere.

In implementing the profound democratization of all spheres of public life, we stand on a firm footing of socialist principles. The political opposition in our country has no chance of legalization, since it is antisocialist in its essence.

The vast majority in our society comes out in favor of socialism, and this is the foundation of the people's moral and political unity. That does not, of course, mean that standardization prevails in our society. Various interests and viewpoints exist, differences exist too. Our political system allows everyone the maximum participation in shaping policy and implementing it in all spheres. Frank debates and the clash of different viewpoints promote the deepening of socialist democracy and help us to take the correct decisions and unite our forces to implement them. That is how our socialist pluralism differs radically from capitalist pluralism.

In line with the 17th CPCZ Congress decisions, work has begun on creating a new CSSR constitution. We want it to enshrine the fundamental changes connected with the

restructuring, we want the supreme code of our socialist democracy, the freedoms, rights, and duties of citizens, and the equality of our peoples and ethnic groups to be fully in accordance with our society's position on the threshold of a new age.

The first 2 years of the 5-year plan have elapsed since the congress. We can already see how the congress line is being pursued and what we must pay special attention to at the present stage.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has examined the results achieved. It must be said frankly that we cannot be satisfied with them. Although the results are somewhat better than in the 7th 5-Year Plan and in the main the fulfillment of the social program is being ensured, in economic development many problems have accumulated, of a subjective and objective nature. The most important point is that the targets set by the plan regarding the formation of national income are not being fulfilled. It was not possible to make full use of the process of intensification, and the growth of social labor productivity lags behind plan targets.

Concern for the utmost economic efficiency is inextricably linked with foreign economic ties, which to a considerable degree influence the formation of national income. Increasing exports to countries with freely convertible currency and maintaining balanced trade with nonsocialist countries is still a major problem.

We must constantly monitor the fulfillment of our commitments in foreign economic ties with the socialist countries, and especially the Soviet Union.

The above problems in creating the sources of finance have a direct bearing on ensuring the planned level of all the main items in the formation of national income. In the first 2 years of the 5-year plan personal consumption increased by more than 2% a year, and social consumption by more than 4%.

We should base our development plans to a greater extent on the deepening of economic cooperation with the socialist countries. Here the priority task must be that of maintaining the dynamics of mutual foreign trade turnover with the Soviet Union on the basis of the development of intrasector specialization and coproduction, the priority development of direct ties between our countries' organizations, and also the creation of joint enterprises and associations.

During the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the CSSR in April of this year, in the course of his meetings with Comrade G. Husak, it was decided to elaborate a long-term prospectus for mutual economic cooperation between individual sectors of our economies for a period of 15-20 years. We are now working on this. Also associated with this is our participation in acts of integration, which we must continue above all in the processing industry sector in accordance with the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries Through the Year 2000.

At the 43d (Extraordinary) CEMA session a decision was adopted on elaborating a collective concept of the international socialist division of labor. The acceleration of socialist economic integration is of vital importance for the CSSR. That is why in the coming period we must move forward rapidly, on a multilateral basis or in cooperation with those countries which are now ready for joint actions toward integration.

We can only fulfill the crucial tasks facing us on condition that the CPCZ heads the process of implementation of all the changes.

All party organs and organizations must significantly accelerate the process of changing the party work style, which must meet the demands and spirit of the time. We must evaluate from this viewpoint our work methods at all levels, from the Central Committee to the primary organizations.

Exceptionally complex tasks have faced us more than once in the past, but always, when the party has marched resolutely toward the goal set, winning over to its side the broadest masses of the people, it has achieved its end. That is true today too.

An open policy, glasnost, democracy, and monitoring are the main prerequisites for successful work by the party and for the implementation of its vanguard role. It is necessary to trust people, consult with them, and listen seriously to their opinion.

The political leadership of society presupposes the strengthening of the role, initiative, and responsibility of state and economic organs. Party organs and organizations cannot take on their functions.

The times are making higher and in many cases new demands on the whole cadre policy, which is based on Leninist principles. In view of the significance and seriousness of questions connected with cadre policy, we submit for discussion by the Central Committee a draft resolution that defines in accordance with the requirements of the present stage the aims and criteria for selecting, training, and placing cadres.

Intraparty life in all party organs and organizations should be characterized by efficiency, openness, and a high sense of responsibility. This is related to the need to ensure the creation of a healthy, critical atmosphere everywhere. Nobody, whatever post he holds, can be above criticism.

The restructuring and further democratization of society also demand the improvement of the work of the Central Committee and its organs. It is necessary to step up the Central Committee's monitoring role, and senior leadership workers must report to it on their work. This applies to party organs at all levels.

An important task to which constant attention must be devoted is that of increasing the role and effectiveness of primary party organizations. It is here that concrete, practical problems are accumulating in connection with the resolution of all the key questions of party policy. The increase in the autonomy and responsibility of enterprises and the widening of their powers require the party organizations to engage in systematic critical analysis of the activity of economic and other organizations.

The party now has more than 1.7 million members and candidate members. This is a tremendous force, but we make no secret of the fact that not all of them are fighters for party policy. The party's strength lies not in numbers, but in the quality of its ranks.

At present the party has launched preparations for the annual party meetings and party conferences, which are to be held in the first half of next year. It is necessary to ensure a creative atmosphere, an atmosphere of broad intraparty democracy and high party responsibility for the consistent implementation of the restructuring of the economic mechanism and the democratization of society's life.

All our plans can only be implemented in conditions of peace. This is the aim of Czechoslovakia's foreign policy efforts, which are coordinated closely with the foreign policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries. One of the main features of present-day international development is the growing influence and peace offensive of socialism. The processes of restructuring and acceleration in the USSR and in the whole socialist community have tremendous international significance too. Under their influence the socialist countries' policy is acquiring a new dynamism.

This is most strikingly manifested in the struggle to halt the arms race, avert the threat of nuclear war, consolidate peace, and strengthen international security. Scientific and technical progress in arms development has placed mankind's very existence in jeopardy. In order to find a solution in our interrelated world new approaches and new political thinking are needed. This is the purpose of the peace program of the 27th CPSU Congress, reflected in the proposal to set up a comprehensive international security system. Already one notices the positive results of this policy. One very important result was the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons during Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's Washington visit. It was a success for the USSR's consistent and constructive policy, a success for the entire socialist community and the world's peace-loving and democratic forces.

Our people welcomed this historic treaty as a victory for reason and political responsibility. On their behalf we express once again thanks and gratitude to the CPSU, the Soviet Government and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev personally for their energy, persistence, and boldness in establishing the new political thinking and new approaches to the solution of the most pressing questions of the present day. The treaty envisages the elimination of Soviet operational-tactical missiles stationed on our territory in response to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe. Therefore we expressed our willingness to carry out the requisite verification measures on our territory.

The key task now is to prevent the militarization of space. It is also necessary to achieve concrete results at the talks on the general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and reduction of conventional arms.

In this connection there was a big response to the the joint initiative by the CSSR and GDR on creating a nuclear- and chemical weapons-free corridor in Central Europe.

The Great October 70th anniversary celebrations in Moscow made a deep impression on us. We saw again how strongly the behests of October influence the present day. It is an immortal, inspiring appeal to our times. We also saw once again the wisdom of the founders of the CPCZ, who gave the party precise directions to travel along the path outlined by V.I. Lenin. It has been a difficult and bumpy journey. Every step forward has been achieved through struggle, and sometimes at a high price. There are glorious and worrying periods in the history of the CPCZ. It has achieved great victories, but it has not avoided mistakes. However, the Communists have demonstrated their insuperable strength, resolve, and ability to make sacrifices in the struggle for a better future. Their strength and conviction are rooted in loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, in the ability to creatively apply and develop it, in devotion to the cause of the working class and the peoples, and to the ideals of socialism.

We will continue to make an active contribution to strengthening the unity of the socialist community and friendship with the USSR and to the historic struggle to preserve peace.

Soon we will be celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Czechoslovak working people's victory over reaction. Our greatest asset today is able, hard-working people dedicated to socialism.

We are following the path of an honest and open policy on the whose basis we will strengthen our party's unity and its link with the broad masses of the people, M. Jakes said in conclusion.

The CPCZ Central Committee plenum adopted resolutions on the questions under discussion.

SFRY Deputy Premier Arrives for Talks

LD212318 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2223 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow,. Dec 21 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Deputy Prime Minister Janez Zemljaric arrived in Moscow earlier this evening for talks with Soviet Vice-Premier Ivan Silayev on Yugoslav-Soviet economic cooperation.

During the two-day talks in Moscow, Zemljaric and Silayev, who are co-chairmen of the Yugoslav-Soviet Committee for Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation, will discuss economic, trade, scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries. The exchange of views will cover cooperation within the framework of the current five-year plkan and globally until the year 2000.

Questions relating to current bilateral trade, which is still burdened with an imbalance caused by a Yugoslavia's export surplus of about 1.4 billion dollars, are also expected to be discussed.

Medvedev Receives Bulgarian Editor

PM181437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

["Own Information" report: "Editor Received"]

[Text] On 17 December V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received R. Radev, chief editor of the newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the PRAVDA Editorial Board.

West Europe

Agreement on INF Inspections in UK Registered

LD212343 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1505 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] London, Dec 21 (TASS)—The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles was described as a "great achievement" by Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs.

Speaking at a ceremony for the exchange of notes between the USSR and Great Britain officially registering the agreement between their governments with regard to implementing on British territory the inspections envisaged by this treaty, he said: "This achievement has shown the deep personal commitment of the leadership of the United States and USSR. It is the triumph of sustained work, art, and vision of the Soviet and U.S. participants in the talks.... Furthermore, the treaty is the first palpable result of what we hope will be a new chapter in relations between East and West. The British Government certainly firmly supports both the treaty itself and the subsequent steps in the field of arms control."

"The United Kingdom is glad to take a direct part in the procedures of monitoring the treaty, the minister stressed. We shall play our role in full in order to ensure its effectiveness.... Arms control by itself cannot be a basis for trust and confidence in relations between East and West, but such verification, as in the present case, will contribute to them and so help in solving other most important questions in the field of arms control. At the same time, if we want to lay down and maintain new relations between East and West, we must achieve progress in other important fields of relations, including human rights and the solving of conflicts in the planet's hotspots. In the final resort, we must aim to expand contacts between people at all levels."

Speaking in reply, Leonid Zamyatin, the USSR ambassador to Great Britain, said: "The achievement of the treaty was possible thanks to the fact that it strictly observes a balance of the two sides' interests, and its tenets embody the concept of equality and reciprocity.... All in all, we are convinced that the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles will lay the beginning of the development of a positive, forward moving process in the disarmament business."

Manufacturing Firm Set Up With Spain

LD211901 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1230 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Luis Solana, president of Telefonica, leading a Spanish delegation to Moscow, has signed there the act of constitution of the first Spanish-Soviet firm, which will devote itself to the manufacture of telephones. Our correspondent in the Soviet capital, Luis Serrano, reports:

[Serrano] A few minutes ago Luis Solana, president of Telefonica; Antonio Lopez, president of Amper; and Erlen Pervyshin, Soviet minister of communications equipment industry, signed in Moscow the act of constitution of the first Spanish-Soviet mixed company. In this company, which will make telephones, Amper has a 45% share and Telefonica, 4%. Fifty-one percent belongs to the Soviet state. The total investment is 1.1 billion pesetas. The planned annual production is 500,000 telephones for the Soviet market, with a small proportion for export.

Talks on setting up this firm have been going on for many months. One major obstacle to the negotiations concerned the import of components necessary for the manufacture of the product, which the Soviet Union will pay for by means of exports to Spain, and not directly in hard currency. This mixed company is the 17th to be set up in the USSR since the law opening the way for foreign investments was promulgated. This law, one of the keystones of restructuring, aroused much expectation at first, but the peculiarities of the Soviet economy have, little by little, discouraged foreign firms.

Talks With Switzerland on Chemical Weapons Ban

LD212327 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Bern, 21 Dec (TASS)—Soviet-Swiss consultations on the issue of banning chemical weapons and a number of other disarmament issues were held here today. In the course of the consultations, unsolved problems connected with the preparation of an international convention on the destruction of all chemical weapons, and primarily issues concerned with the nonproduction of this weapon in commercial industry, were examined in detail.

Today, too, Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, the USSR's representative and the head of the Soviet delegation at the consultations, and Zoya Novoshilova, the USSR's ambassador to Switzerland, were received by Edouard Brunner, secretary of state at Switzerland's Foreign Ministry.

Briefs

Business Links With Finland

Moscow, 21 December (TASS)—The state of Soviet-Finnish business links in the markets of third countries and prospects for their development were examined at a regular session of the working group, which ended in Moscow today. Those taking part in it discussed possible forms of cooperation in construction in those countries of metallurgical enterprises, thermal power stations, cement works, pulp and paper combines, and public health facilities. Having noted that successful performance on the markets of third countries depends to a large extent on the conditions of financing joint projects, they agreed to continue the search for mutually acceptable solutions to this question and to exchange information on a regular basis about possible cooperation projects. The next session of the bilateral working group is planned to be held during the second half of 1988. [Text] [*Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1322 GMT 21 Dec 87 LD*]

Political & Social

New Stamp Commemorates INF Treaty

LD181643 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—The USSR Ministry of Communications has issued a stamp commemorating the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on eliminating two classes of nuclear weapons.

Soviet and American national flags are depicted in the stamp's upper part. Between them is a palm branch against the background of the globe.

In the centre there is a caption saying "The Treaty on Eliminating Soviet and American Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is the first step towards a nuclear-free world."

Below the caption are the Kremlin Spasskaya Tower and the building of the U.S. Congress on Capitol Hill.

The stamp also has the inscription "December 1987."

Internal Affairs Minister on Emigration

PM211151 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 p 3

[Novosti observer V. Ostrovskiy article: "What Is Behind the Figures"]

[Text] According to a recent VOA report, a few days ago the U.S. Department of State expressed its approval for the fact that the Soviet authorities have given 15 Soviet citizens permission to emigrate. But the Department of State also expressed regret about the fate of "thousands of other citizens" who, in its opinion, are "refuseniks."

At a recent USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center news conference held on the occasion of the setting up in our country of a public commission for international cooperation on humanitarian problems and human rights, a British journalist raised the question of the number of Jews wishing to emigrate from the USSR. A Foreign Ministry spokesman explained that various figures are circulating in the West. Israeli sources speak of 400,000 Jews allegedly wishing to leave the Soviet Union. In this case, though, the number of applicants is replaced by the number of invitations sent to our country from Israel. Another figure is also circulating in the West—11,000 Jews supposedly wanting to emigrate from the Land of the Soviets. When interviewing M.S. Gorbachev NBC-TV correspondent T. Brokaw mentioned yet another figure—4,000 who are apparently waiting to emigrate from the USSR.

These contradictory figures testify to the absence of accurate information in the West. Let us turn to facts.

The Soviet Union, without waiting for the adoption of a special international agreement on problems of human contacts (it was elaborated in Bern in the spring of 1986 but was not adopted due to the obstructionist stance taken by the U.S. delegation), went even beyond the provisions enshrined in the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, and the Madrid Final Document. Our country adopted new procedures for examining applications in the case of family reunions. While the Madrid document sets a time limit of 6 months for this, the regulation adopted in the USSR sets a time limit of 1 month, to be extended to not more than 6 months only when there may be a need for additional study of the attendant circumstances.

Family relations underlie all international agreements concerning human contacts. Our regulations envisage the examination of applications for reunion with natural brothers or natural sisters even though, as it is well-known, such persons are not always members of the applicant's family.

I called Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov, USSR minister of internal affairs, and asked him about the total number of people wishing to emigrate from our country.

"A total of 7,007 persons emigrated in the first 11 months of this year," he replied.

"And how many were refused permission?"

"Some 732 of those who applied for permission to emigrate, and primarily for reasons of state security," the minister said. "There were people of Jewish nationality among them."

It is worth recalling that the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights allows restrictions on emigration and immigration (Article 12, Paragraph 3). These restrictions apply for the purpose of protecting state security, public order, society's health or moral foundations, and other people's rights and freedoms. And, incidentally, the Pact allows the adoption of national laws and other restrictions.

As for the diligence of some Western mass media, which are clearly distorting the number of citizens wishing to emigrate from our country, this is being exercised in pursuit of prejudiced and speculative objectives, to generate among the world public mistrust in the Soviet policy of glasnost and broad democratization of Soviet society.

Refusnik Allowed To Emigrate After 16-Years

AU211803 Paris AFP in English 1753 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 21 (AFP)—Soviet refuznik Alexandr Lerner, who has been seeking to emigrate for 16 years, has been authorised to leave the Soviet Union, he said Monday.

Mr Lerner, 73, told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE by telephone that he wished to emigrate "only to Israel" and that his son Vladimir, 42, his daughter-in-law Tatiana, 26, together with their two-year-old daughter Yulia, had also been given authorisation to leave.

A world-famous cybernetics expert, Mr Lerner attributed the change of heart by Soviet authorities to representations on his behalf by Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke, who recently made an official visit to Moscow, by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and by U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Mr Lerner made his first application to emigrate to Israel in 1971, but was told that he could not leave the Soviet Union because he had worked on projects involving "state secrets".

He told the western press last March that he worked on secret projects some 25 years ago, but that the results of his research had long since been published, in the foreign press as well as in Soviet publications.

Anti-KGB Demonstrators Jailed for 15 Days
AU211557 Paris AFP in English
1549 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 21 (AFP)—Two Soviet dissident members of the Confidence Group were jailed for 15 days on Monday for demonstrating in Leningrad Sunday against the Soviet state security body, the KGB, a spokesman for the group said.

The demonstration at which the women, Olga Kovalchuk and Ekaterina Poldoltseva, called for the KGB organisation to be reduced by half, was timed to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the KGB.

The spokesman said the two dissidents had started a hunger strike.

Eight other members of the group were arrested in Moscow for preparing to demonstrate against the KGB, but were released after a few hours.

Police in Moscow have generally released demonstrators after questioning, but in Leningrad several demonstrators have recently been sentenced to up to 15 days in prison, according to dissident sources.

Anatoly Dubkov, also of the Confidence Group, was sentenced to 15 days in prison in Leningrad for taking part in a demontration on December 10, Human Rights Day, and has gone on hunger strike, the group spokesman said.

Ryzkhov Speaks at Alma-Ata Aktiv 18 Dec
LD182304 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the Kazakh capital today, a meeting was held between Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and the party and economic aktiv of the republic. It was opened by Comrade Nazarbayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh SSR. Comrade Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh communist party Central Committee, spoke about the work of the republican party organization at this stage of restructuring and about major tasks for the future. (video shows Nazarbayev and Kolbin addressing meeting, then shows Ryzhkov.) Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov made a speech at the meeting. He said, among other things:

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] The democratization of society and the radical economic reform are two key tasks inextricably bound together. They predetermine the fate of restructuring and guarantee that it cannot be reversed. The beginning of the practical implementation of the economic reform ushers in a new stage in restructuring. As Lenin used to say"the time when political descriptions of great tasks were required has passed. The time has come for their practical implementation." The tasks of 1988 deal with consolidating and developing positive changes in the economy. The coming year's main characteristic is that the principles of the integral system of economic management will be implemented on a large scale. Enterprises and associations producing 60 percent of industrial output will have full financial autonomy and self-financing, as well as all labor collectives of the agroindustrial branches of the RSFSR, the Baltic republics, Belorussia, plus a number of oblasts in the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, and three oblasts in Kazakhstan.

Many labor collectives in other sectors are becoming involved in this process. What assessment can be made of how preparations are going for the switchover to new methods of economic management? It must be noted that this year the preparations have been made in a more organized fashion and to a deeper extent than a year ago when the first five of the country's industries were preparing for this step. However, a number of serious shortcomings and decelerating factors have been revealed which were noted at the conference in the CPSU Central Committee in early December on the state of affairs and tasks facing sectors and enterprises arising out of the switch to full financial autonomy and self-financing. These shortcomings are fairly widespread, and if no decisive step is taken to overcome them, they may have an extremely negative effect on the activity of enterprises and associations and on the state of affairs in the labor collectives.

One of the most important aims in the restructuring of the economic mechanism is the development of democracy in the production sector. Broad scope is now being

objectively given for this democracy, and this is not only a question of the electing of labor collective councils and managers, although these are very important aspects of self-management. The most important thing is for the new economic mechanism to objectively induce labor collectives to take a more active part in production management and the solution of all questions of production and social life. Turning the working people into their own masters is the main path toward the democratization of production.

The objective conditions and need for the developement of production democracy and self-management are now enshrined in the law on enterprises. Now it is impermissble to await special instructions and directives from above. People must take things into their own hands and manage efficiently and skulfully. That is the task of today.

Comrades, in the 7 decades of Soviet power, truly revolutionary changes have taken place in the economy of Kazakhstan. Among the union republics, the Kazakh SSR has the third largest amount of capital investments. The state of the country's national economic organism depends largely on how things are going in the economy of Kazakhstan. At the same time, the distortions and phenomena of stagnation in Kazakhstan have assumed an ugly nature. As far as the Kazakhstan national economy is concerned, the reasons for the deceleration are well known. The state of affairs in the economy and other spheres is now being put right. Judging by the preliminary figures for the first 2 years of the 12th 5-year plan period, the republic will fulfill and, in a number of cases, overfulfill the plan targets. All these facts indicate that in Kazakhstan, in the republican party organization, the tone is being set by healthy and politically mature forces capable of leading the working people in solving the tasks of our time, and that the multinational detachment of Kazakhstan working people is distinguished by its high political awareness and faith in the ideals of socialism. They indicate that the process of restructuring is gaining in strength and that it has already been possible to achieve a number of good and useful things.

At the same time, many complex problems accumulated during the period of stagnation which are holding back growth in the republic's economy and its contribution to the common cause. And these problems must be discussed frankly and in terms of principle, as is the party way.

The central line to take is increasing the public-sector labor productivity and orienting production toward the use of advanced technology and equipment. It would seem that no one doubts that conclusion, however we are coming up against great difficulties in putting it into practice. Where these difficulties arise is shown, among other things, in your practical experience. According to the figures of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, in 1986 on 67 percent of the republic's industrial enterprises carried out scientific and technological measures, and that level was achieved basically through the efforts of two oblasts—Karaganda and Uralsk. The time when all we did was to make calls for the introduction of new equipment has passed. The time has now come for decisive action and economic responsibility. That is the only way we will be able to make up the technology lag in the national economy which is preventing us from reaching the forefront in labor productivity and output quality.

In Kazakhstan, at 38 enterprises where state acceptance service was introduced, the January-November plan for sales of products, allowing for delivery pledges, has been fulfilled by only 96 percent. These enterprises account for more than 40 percent of the total volume of undelivered contracted products. And the circle of collectives working under the state acceptance system is to be widened. Preparation for the state acceptance system should be thorough and not confined to appeals and organizational measures. For industrially-developed countries, economizing has become an obligatory condition, a fact of economic life. All this requires of us, of you, a further radical emphasis on saving resources and the tapping of all reserves, of which there are a great many in the republic.

Today's discussion, comrades, does not include an examination of every aspect of economic work in Kazakhstan, but on the whole, in our view, it is unsatisfactory. One cannot disregard such an alarming fact as the fall in the fulfillment of industrial goods delivery pledges. This year this indicator is even lower than last year's level and amounts to less than 98 percent over 11 months. One in four enterprises is not meeting contractual pledges, while in light industry it is one in three.

I shall dwell on individual issues in the development of the republic's agroindustrial complex. Eleven percent of the country's agricultural potential is concentrated here. From here the state gets one-fourth of its wool, one-twelfth of its meat and one-fifth of its grain. And what is especially important, nearly 85 percent of the wheat for food consists of strong, hard, and valuable varieties. The Party Central Committee and the government fully approve of the measures being taken by the Kazakhstan Communist Party to overcome the lag in the development of the agroindustrial sector. But the republic as a whole is still a long way from serious improvements in agriculture. Having favorable conditions for food production, the republic ships significant quantities of fruit, berries, canned fruit and vegetables, vegetable oil, sugar, confectionary and pasta products, and margarine. The volumes of products shipped are not only not decreasing but, on the contrary, are visibly growing in particular categories.

The Kazakh SSR will have to increase its grain harvest by almost 10 million tons compared with the last 5-year plan period. This is not an ordinary economic task, but an issue of broad policy. This is what republican bodies should proceed from.

What is the position, then, in livestock breeding? It is developing exceedingly unfavorably. Production costs are increasing every year. Over the past 15 years, the cost of producing each additional ton of cattle, milk, and wool has more than doubled. The milk yield per cow remains at the 1977 level. Farms are suffering bearing considerable losses from diseases and death of animals. This has already been discussed today. This happens every single year, and the staff of the agroindustrial committee know all this well. Among the complex problems related to radically improving the food supply for the population, measures for further strengthening the material and technical bases of the processing industries of the agroindustrial complex and for overcoming its profound technological backwardness assume special importance.

A gulf has developed between even moderate growth of agricultural output and possibilities for its industrial processing. Suffice it to say, that in the past 5-year plan period, not a single enterprise for processing cattle and poultry has been commissioned in the republic. Not a single one! A most difficult situation has arisen with regard to storage depots, cold stores, and installations for processing fruit and vegetables. In line with measures in the decision adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, the republic must carry out a radical change in developing the processing industry.

Output of consumer goods per ruble of the salary fund in Kazakhstan is falling every year. While in 1983, output was calculated at one rouble—that is one rouble's worth of goods were produced per ruble of salary—now output is 90 kopeks. The situation is getting worse because many republican enterprises manufacture goods of poor quality which are not in demand. Despite the decisions about involving all industrial enterprises in manufacturing consumer goods, regardless of their specialization or the departments to which they belong, one-third of the Kazakh enterprises are still not producing them.

I would like to say a few words about services. The plan for developing services in the republic are being fulfilled and even overfulfilled. But precisely because of this, there is no cause for complacency. While in 1986 in the country as a whole there was R177 of chargeable services per capita, which we consider to be completely insufficient, in Kazakhstan this was merely R135. Special attention should be paid to the new opportunities that have opened up with the adoption of the law on individual labor activity and with the principled course for the development of cooperatives in the services sector and the manufacture of consumer goods. These issues are being dealt with in the Republic; the process has begun. But we cannot help but notice that Kazakhstan significantly lags behind the majority of the union republics, including, for example, Georgia and Lithuania, where the populations are smaller by factors of three and five, while their provision of consumer goods and services is significantly better than yours.

Comrades, the CPSU Central Committee and the Government are paying special attention to the implementation of the directives of the 27th Party Congress for the conduct of a strong social policy and a decisive turn by the planning and management bodies of central and local economic organizations towards social requirements. If we remain true to ourselves, we have to admit that in many aspects there has not yet been such a turn in this republic. The inertia of technocratic approaches to the social aspects of production is not being overcome with sufficient persistence. The acuteness of problems which have become urgent in the health service, public education and the provision of conditions for leading a full life and for meaningful recreation is being underestimated. I would like to emphasize once again that persistent concern for solving questions of labor, living conditions, culture, and for fulfilling people's interests and needs should become law for all state and economic bodies, public organizations, and every leader.

Comrades, the problems of development of the country and the republic that were raised today differ in many aspects—in their nature, complexity, the degree of approval of the ways and means of solution, and the significance for the society. But they also have quite a lot in common. First, they all come from life, from our daily reality; they are not farfetched and we cannot put any of them off until later. These are our problems and no one is going to solve them for us; no one is going to absolve us of our responsibility.

Secondly, no matter which of the present-day problems we pick out—be it economic reform or democratization, social policy or cadre work, we find man at the root of it all everywhere. And this is natural. The meaning of restructuring lies precisely in realizing and multiplying the potential of socialism through the realization and multiplication of human potential. As always at the sharp turning points of our history, the decisive word has been and remains with the communists. They have to play the role of a true vanguard, to rouse people through their example and make them follow in their steps, be constantly in the midst of the masses and generate the energy for renewal. Then all the difficulties facing the country will be overcome and all tasks fulfilled.

Allow me to thank you for the opportunity to familiarize myself in detail with the situation in the key sectors and regions of the republic and to express the conviction that Kazakhstan's party organization, the vanguard of the working people of the republic, will be able to solve the tasks it is facing in the historic time of restructuring. Thank you. [applause] [end recording]

More on Ryzhkov's Address

LD181632 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 18 Dec 87

[Text] A meeting between Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the

party and economic aktiv of Kazakhstan took place in Alma-Ata today. Comrade Kolbin, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, gave a report on the work of the republic's party organization at the present stage of restructuring and on the main tasks for the future.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov spoke at the meeting. He said that truly revolutionary changes have occurred in the economy of Kazakhstan in the 7 decades of Soviet power. The republic has become the flagship of the country's nonferrous metallurgy, a leading center of ferrous metallurgy, the chemical industry, the extraction of fuel, and production of electricity and one of the leading granaries. The state of the national economic organism of the country depends in large measure on how affairs proceed in the economy of Kazakhstan. To judge from preliminary data, in the first 2 years of the 12th 5-year plan the republic will fulfill—and even overfulfill in a number of categories—its plan commitments. The large-scale work to solve one of the most burning social issues—the provision of housing for the working people—which has developed in Kazakhstan, is of great social importance. All these facts testify to the fact that the tone is being set by healthy forces in the republic and the party organization. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government appreciate for their true value the results which have been obtained. The changes for the better are in large measure a result of the utilization of the great reserves that exist.

At the same time, many complex problems restraining the growth of the republic's economy have accumulated. It is necessary to talk in a party-minded, frank [otkrovenno], and principled manner about these problems, as well, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said.

Permit me to dwell just on some highly important matters in your life. One of them is the chronic lagging of the level of labor productivity behind the union average, which was not cut between 1981 and 1987, and even grew. The central way of increasing labor productivity lies in orientating production toward advanced technology and equipment. But technical policy in the branches of industry is being pursued sluggishly and inconsistently in the republic. The technical standard of developments from the republic's scientific research, design and technological organizations is low.

In addition, the speaker dwelt on quality, stressing that this issue of questions in our economy remains acute for Kazakhstan, too. One must not pass over such an alarming fact as deterioration in the situation regarding fulfillment of obligations for supplies of industrial production. Every fifth enterprise in Kazakhstan is not fulfilling its commitments for raising labor productivity and lowering prime costs of production. He pointed out that, in capital construction, chronic negative phenomena—and, in particular, lagging of the commissioning of facilities behind the assimilation of capital investments—are still being overcome slowly.

The time taken over construction is protracted. In spite of certain improvements, there are also many shortcomings in building facilities in the social and cultural sphere. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov stressed that it is necessary to seek additional resources for the successful implementation of the housing construction program and acceleration of its rate.

The rapporteur devoted much attention to one of the immediate problems facing the country today—ensuring stable food supplies to the population. Party and economic bodies will have to approach their evaluation of the role of the republic's agro-industrial complex in a new style and look at its development from the position of the whole country. This applies above all to the grain sector.

The financial condition of the state, the republic, and the labor collective is a mirror of the economy. Comrade Ryzhkov expressed the serious anxiety of the party Central Committee and the government at the strain in this sphere. The situation in Kazakhstan is patently unfavorable. Every fifth industrial enterprise and construction organization is not fulfilling its plan for profits.

In his speech Comrade Ryzhkov dwelt on the subject of party, local soviet and economic cadres, stressing that the forthcoming period will be a very serious examination for them. Finally, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers expressed certainty that the party organization of Kazakhstan will be able to solve the tasks facing it in the historic time of restructuring.

Ryzhkov Visits Tselinograd Oblast

LD181321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Dec 87

[V. Lyashko report over video; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, who is in Kazakhstan, has visited Tselinograd Oblast.

[Lyashko] At the (Zarechnyy) sovkhoz Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov showed great interest when touring a new experimental settlement built according to original architectural designs. In the settlement's food shop, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers chatted with customers and sales staff and asked how the working people of the village were being supplied with essential foodstuffs.

In the course of a trip around Tselinograd, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov also visited the shops. In the oblast center, the problem of trade in meat and dairy products is being solved quite well [neplokho]. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov chatted with residents of the oblast center. He was interested to find out what the people of Tselinograd

think of the changes taking place in our society, as well as their opinion on how the urgent problems in trade, services, and housing construction are being resolved in teh virgin lands area.

On the same day, Comrade Ryzhkov visited the Tselinogradselmash production association. Here, he enquired about the process of the enterprise's preparation for switching over to self-financing and financial autonomy, and about the work undertaken to boost output quality.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov visited the Academician Barayev All-Union Grain Farming Research Institute. This scientific center, well known in our country, makes a big contribution to the development of agrarian science. It was here that a soil-protecting system of cultivation was developed, which once saved the virgin lands from wind erosion and today helps the grain growers in the steppe areas to obtain stable harvests. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov inspected prototypes of machinery that has now gone into serial production by our industry, as well as models of new, more productive equipment for soil-protection technology.

Selective breeding hs been greatly developed in recent times. Scientists at the institute have produced new drought-resistant grain varieties for areas in North Kazakhstan, the Urals, and western Siberia. Staff at the institute are now doing a great deal to assist the widespread introduction of intensive farming techniques in grain and feed crop cultivation, and are drawing up recommendations for the more rational operation of agricultural production in the virgin lands. [video shows housing development, Ryzhkov and unidentifiefd men walking through housing, shopping areas; then shows Ryzhkov touring factory and laboratory]

Kiev Gorkom Holds Plenum 12 Dec

AU181348 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 13 Dec 87 p 3

[RATAU report: "A Kiev Gorkom Plenum"]

[Text] A Kiev Gorkom plenum was held on 12 December to examine the obkom bureau's accountability report on the work performed in control over restructuring. The report was delivered by K. I. Masik, Kiev Gorkom first secretary.

Twenty-three plenum participants took the floor in the discussion. Attention was focused on problems concerning the democratization of public life, and the progress made in the radical economic reform. The speakers emphasized the need to make fuller use of the restructuring potential and of the city party organization's potential, to improve the style and methods of work in party committees, and to invigorate the activity of basic party organizations.

The plenum was addressed by Ye. Z. Razumov, first deputy chief of the Organizational Party Work Department in the CPSU Central Committee. The plenum proceedings were attended by I. A. Shvets, leader of a group of advisers of the Organizational Party Work Department in the CPSU Central Committee; A. I. Korniyenko, chief of the Organizational Party Work Department in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; and other responsible functionaries of the CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committees.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, delivered a speech to the plenum participants.

(A report on the plenum proceedings will be published).

Georgian Central Committee Holds Plenum

LD200511 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] In Tbilisi today, a plenum of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee was held. It considered the task of transferring enterprises to full financial autonomy and self-financing in 1988. The report by Comrade Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, and speeches, stressed that the party's enormous influence on the economic restructuring process is now becoming the basic support for all the work.

The plenum participants stated that although there is some intimation of change, its pace is lagging behind demands. Ensuring a reliable beginning for a changeover to full financial autonomy and self-financing means seeking inner resources more efficiently and being braver in going beyond existing stereotypes.

AUCCTU Plenum Proceedings Reported

PM181335 Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Dec 87 p 1

["Information Report on AUCCTU Plenum"—TRUD headline]

[Text] The Second AUCCTU plenum continued its work in Moscow yesterday.

The plenum examined the question of "the Tasks of the Trade Union Committees and Councils in Accelerating the Solution of the Food Question in Accordance with the Directives of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum." M.B. Ryzhikov, secretary of AUCCTU and chairman of the Agro-industrial Complex Workers Trade Union Central Committee, delivered the report.

The following took part in the discussion of the report: V.N. Koltakova, chairman of the trade union committee of the sovkhoz named for the 24th party congress,

Mamontovskiy Rayon, Altay Kray; V.I. Goncharik, chairman of the Belorussian Republican Trade Union Council; Ye.i. Vokancha, boiler at the Moldavian SSR "Varnitsa" Agro-industrial Association's Bendery cannery named for M.I. Kalinin; V.N. Morenko, general director of the Novosibirsk Oblast "Ob" Production Association; V.V. Kalyagin, chairman of the Stavropol Kray Trade Union Council; T.A. Bolshakova, worker at the Arkalyk Meat Packing Plant, Turgay Oblast; I.I. Kashin, chairman of the trade union committee of the Mikhaylovskiy mining and enrichment combine named for the 60th anniversary of the USSR, Kursk Oblast; M.A. Srebnyy, chairman of the Coal Industry Workers Trade Union Central Committee; O.I. Gavrilova, worker at the dairy products shop of the Talas Dairy combine, Kirghiz SSR; V.I. Dergachev, chairman of the RSFSR republican committee of the Agro-industrial Complex Workers Trade Union; and P.A. Lyavitskas, trade union committee chairman of the "Payesis" sovkhoz, Kaunasskiy Rayon, Lithuanian SSR.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question discussed.

V.P. Provotorov, secretary of AUCCTU, gave a report entitled "On the Draft Budget of the USSR Trade Unions and the State Social Insurance Budget for 1988."

The following took part in the discussion on the report: I.YA. Larchenko, chairman of the Belgorod Oblast Trade Union Council; T.N. Yeliseyeva, chairman of the Leningrad Obkom Medical Workers Trade Union; and V.L. Vasilyev, chairman of the "Kuybyshevneft" Production Association Trade Union Committee.

The plenum approved the USSR trade union budget for 1988 and confirmed the state social security budget for 1988.

The AUCCTU plenum ended its work on this.

Yu.i. Mordvintsev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department; N.F. Kuznetsov, deputy sector chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational and Party Work Department; and leaders of ministries and departments took part in the plenum's work.

The report on the second day of the plenum's work will be published in the newspaper's coming issues.

Lukyanov Speaks at Conference on Legal Issues

LD211611 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Dec 87

[Text] Ways of further strengthening socialist legality-,law and order, and the protection of the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, as well as the process of implementing the CPSU Central Committee resolution on this issue were discussed by the participants in an all-union conference of leading employees of the legal system in Moscow today. The keynote speaker, USSR justice minister of Kravtsov, and the speakers, talked about the topical tasks of the courts in the current phase of restructuring. The conference examined the experience which has been amassed and discussed proposals for further improving the work of the courts. Particular attention was afforded by the participants to questions of removing existing shortcomings in the legal activity of the courts.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Comrade Lukyanov spoke at the conference.

Armenian CP's 'Unprincipled' Approach Viewed

PM221053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent N. Demidov report: "Responsibility for a Reply. Consequences of Unprincipled Approach in Yerevan to Checking a Letter"]

[Text] Yerevan—first of all, an apology is owed to Anzhela Grigoryevna Khachikyan, former engineer at the "Armpromproyekt" Institute and mother of two. In a piece in our newspaper last year she was listed among the complainants groundlessly calling for more and more [investigative] commissions and engaging in vilification.

As it turned out, there was a great deal of truth in her letters. The mistake occurred because of the unscrupulous attitude of the personnel in the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee whom the editorial office asked to check Khachikyan's alarming reports. PRAVDA hoped that all the circumstances of the affair would be studied carefully. But this did not occur.

Part One, in Which Categorical Judgments Arouse No Doubts [subhead]

And so the editorial office received a letter from former project chief engineer A. Khachikyan in which she complained of unlawful dismissal. More precisely, she says, she was the "victim of a staff cut" over her criticism.

At the same time the letter from Yerevan told of an unsatisfactory situation at the planning institute and shortcomings in economic activity. We thought it advisable to refer the complaint for examination by the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, from which a reply, signed by Central Committee Secretary M. Muradyan, was soon received.

From the official reply: "At A. Khachikyan's request, a commission formed by the republic's Gosstroy several times conducted documentary checks of her complaints. But she did not agree with the results of all the checks.

"Each time, before and after the commissions were set up, she demanded a review of the decisions adopted. The institute collective repeatedly asked higher party, soviet, and law enforcement organs and newspaper editorial offices for protection from A. Khachikyan's complaints and slander."

You will agree, the description is not one which inspires a liking for the letterwriter. Matters had reached the point where the entire collective was sounding the alarm as victims of slander. What kind of person was she: She had failed her certification reviews three times and had seven reprimands... But the editorial office did not jump to conclusions and once again asked M. Muradyan to recheck all the facts in depth and objectively.

I am compelled to draw attention to the details of the correspondence, for they will help you to understand more precisely the mechanism of the emergence of more and more complaints. As will become clear later, the conflict transcended the limits of a purely production affair.

From the official reply: "A. Khachikyan considers that her dismissal was the result of victimization by Institute Director M. Peshtimaldzhyan, whom she criticized for shortcomings in his work.

"It should be noted that the violations at 'Armpromproyekt' were disclosed not on Khachikyan's initiative but by checks of alerts received by the republican People's Control Committee. Considering herself to have a real grievance, she continues to complain, pressing for criminal proceedings against the director and using impermissible means and slander.

"Khachikyan was dismissed in strict accordance with the Labor Code and is not subject to reinstatement."

Seemingly there was nothing to refute here, everything was clear. The inveterate complainer was undermining the director's authority and trying to cast aspersions on a successful collective. The reply of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee secretary was published... But Khachikyan again denied everything. And added:

"Just listen to me for a change!"

Part Two, in Which Some Circumstances of the Affair Become Clear [subhead]

Anzhela Grigoryevna looks you sternly straight in the eye. She has a pile of documents in hand. No, it is not easy to listen to her. She gets excited if you object or express doubts and loudly protests that she is right. This is her nature. She displays a directness which makes some people wince as though they had a toothache and which others simply do not accept at all...

This did not start only yesterday. A few years ago A. Khachikyan reported official violations committed by Yu. Tsaturyan, chief of the design office. He was demoted. Then the republican People's Control Committee carried out a check on the basis of an anonymous alert. Tsaturyan, who was by then... deputy director of the institute, was dismissed from this post too.

Then Anzhela Grigoryevna sent a new statement to the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee on shortcomings in the institute's work. A republican Gosstroy Commission did not confirm the facts. After this—again following up an anonymous report—the institute was visited by workers from the Armenian SSR People's Control Committee, to whom Anzhela Grigoryevna presented her information. This time the facts (almost the same) were confirmed. There were crude violations of personnel and financial discipline and the procedure for paying out bonuses, establishing additional wage payments, and giving material aid. Here is just one example of many. Overfulfillment of the plan for one quarter was achieved by means of overreporting and bonuses amounting to R18,800 were paid out illegally. Even M. Muradyan does not deny the guilt of the institute leaders.

From the official reply: "Peshtimaldzhyan was severely reprimanded and fined 3 months' salary, and S. Arutyunov, chief of the production planning department, was dismissed from his post. In addition, Peshtimaldzhyan was reprimanded by decision of the Spandaryanskiy Armenian Communist Party Raykom."

A list of the institute's leading workers who had undeservedly received sizable payments figured in the report of the republican People's Control Committee. Overpayments amounting to almost R13,000 were made over a year. By various contrivances, instead of R6,000 about R40,000 were used for one-shot grants. This aid was given mainly to highly paid personnel, often the same people.

Khachikyan was dismissed immediately after the results of the People's Control Committee checks, but the decision had to be revoked as illegal. Never mind, as the saying goes, if at first you don't succeed... At this point they conducted a certification review, including in the commission some of those whom Anzhela Grigoryevna had criticized. She did not pass the certification, of course, although she had worked honestly in the institute for 15 years.

At the end of the year her workload was reduced, although she was the chief project engineer, and requests not to reduce the load were disregarded. (Then they reproached her for having the smallest workload.) Then she was bombarded with reprimands, and finally Khachikyan was dismissed in a staff cut.

There is a Armenian Council of Ministers resolution on measures to limit the increase and reduce the number of personnel in the management apparatus and other

branches of the nonproduction sphere. In implementing this document a number of staffers, including Khachikyan, were dismissed. She states: I am not a worker in the management apparatus but the chief project engineer. This is one of the leading figures in the institute. The reply was this: "Armpromproyekt's" workload had been reduced, so staff had to be cut. Khachikyan defended herself: Why then do statistical organs have information that the number of workers remains as before? Each year the institute revises its plan upwards, and this occurred after my dismissal. In addition, personnel cost discipline has continued to be violated. Last year, instead of six chief project engineers, eight worked in the planning department, all with high salaries. Where is the staff cut here?

Part Three, Which Explains Part One [subhead]

Yes, Anzhela Grigoryevna did lock horns with the institute director. The official reply to the editorial office says that M. Peshtimaldzhyan "skillfully combines his specialized knowledge with his management work and is considered a competent specialist." But Khachikyan maintains otherwise: He had never before been involved in planning work, his former post was deputy director for economic matters. The files confirm this...

Now for his "specialized knowledge." At the institute I could not help feeling that I was faced with a basic case of closing ranks. Who was denouncing Khachikyan more vehemently than anyone? Those who were receiving unduly high bonuses, wage supplements, and material aid. For example, G. Nazaryan, party bureau secretary, and M. Bisharyan, chairman of the trade union committee. After checks by people's inspectors, party proceedings were also instituted against them.

So it can be imagined with what alacrity the members of the punished "trio" signed the uncomplimentary evaluation report on Khachikyan. Those whom the director found suitable supported him and counted on protection and patronage. Although the republic People's Control Committee dismissed Yu. Tsaturyan and Department Chief S. Arutyunova, now they are virtually occupying the same posts. Yet Arutyunova even contrived to get another reprimand after a routine check.

This story contains a point which requires particular attention—a letter to PRAVDA, with dozens of signatures, from the institute staffers. Of course, the role of the labor collectives today is great, and their appeals look weighty. But the important point is how they play this role and how it is stage-managed. I talked with those who were invited to put their names to accusing Khachikyan of criminal(!) activity.

Zh. Makhmurova, group leader:

"I signed automatically without even reading the letter. They simply say that Khachikyan is writing letters all over the place. What about? I don't know."

E. Asriyeva, specialist:

"I signed the letter because I heard about the tension in the collective. I never ran into Khachikyan at work, and I had no personal contact with her."

Z. Tonikyan, chief project architect:

"I refused to sign the letter. Anzhela Grigoryevna is an energetic specialist, although abrupt, but she tries to make the work go well. And one more thing: She is very honest."

I admit that there were other opinions, particularly with reference to her quarrelsome disposition. But on the whole the conversations raised the question: Would we all refuse to sign an unknown text, if the chief requested it? The text of the letter read as follows: "The role of our director, Melkon Akopovich, emerges more clearly today—he began restructuring from the day he entered his post, in 1980, and the results are there to be seen."

Let's take a break from praise and rosy pictures. Let's look into the activity of the "restructuring" Peshtimaldzhyan. A departmental check by the republican Gosstroy established: The crudest violations in financial activity remained both last year and this. Two instances for comparison. According to the report, "work worth R215,000 was simply not carried out" on 14 projects envisaged in the plan for national economic development. On the other hand, almost R75,000 more than was supposed to be was paid out from the incentives fund. The aim was as before: To grab more!

Khachikyan's letters had told of this 3 years ago!

Of course, M. Muradyan also knew of the unsatisfactory situation at the institute. He saw those same documents and himself talked with Khachikyan. But not one argument, not even an indisputable one, was taken into account. The impression was that he was in the mood not for listening but for rejecting. What is going on here? What were the secret motives? Who so diligently supported the guilty director?

How should we interpret this fact? The prosecutor and chairman of the republican Supreme Court, S. Osipyan and A. Gevorkyan, presented papers to the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee in which they claim that criminal proceedings against Peshtimaldzhyan were stopped for lack of evidence that a crime had been committed. But A. Boretskiy, chief of the USSR Prosecutor's Office General Supervision Administration, reports that criminal proceedings were stopped because of an amnesty act. This is something quite different.

The person who signs an official reply takes responsibility for it. Like those who prepared the material. In this case, G. Grdilyan, deputy chief of an Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Department, was

instructed to investigate the situation in detail. And so we were among the participants in the conflict. Feelings ran high. Gamlet Smbatovich cannot explain why, in a year when Khachikyan did not pass a single certification review, she was named a winner in socialist competition. Why do seven reprimands figure everywhere when the republican Trade Union Council Legal Inspectorate canceled five of them? Khachikyan's last reprimand was issued because she was absent for 2 hours to to go to the hospital. Why was she punished and is her guilt comparable with those who systematically committed violations in economic activity? Grdilyan raises his hands as if he is learning all this for the first time. Here he is, the direct executant of the order, the person who was obliged to study the affair down to the last detail and to present an honest and principled answer to his leadership. Had that happened, the PRAVDA editorial office would probably not have been misled.

This irritating mistake caused by an unprincipled attitude to preparing the official reply is, I think, yet another reflection of the obsolete work style of the republican Communist Party Central Committee, a style which, as is known, was seriously criticized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

This whole story was in essence a test of the ability to value restless and independent-minded people who are intolerant of shortcomings. The absence of genuine party influence has led to a situation where many in the institute consider right not those who fight against the violations but those who permit them.

...When this piece was being prepared for the press and Peshtimaldzhyan and his supporters were "besieging" editorial offices in the hope of preventing publication, a report came from Yerevan: The republican People's Control Committee has completed another check of a report of violations and abuses at the "Armpromproyekt" Institute. According to preliminary data, the facts are basically confirmed.

Procedure To Protest Dismissal, Redundancy

PM181509 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 4

[Unattributed article: "TRUD Consultation 16 December 1987: Who Should Resolve the Dispute"]

[Text] "I was made redundant as part of a staff cut sanctioned by the trade union committee. I did not accept that decision and appealed to the trade union gorkom to revoke the trade union committee's decision. However, the gorkom did not help me and advised me to appeal to the trade union council. The council, they said, has a legal inspectorate for labor which has the power to give the administration a binding order to give me my old job back. The legal inspectorate also turned me down. Then I was forced to go to the people's court. But the judge rejected my application on the grounds that more than 1 month had elapsed since my dismissal. Where do I go now?" (M. Feoktistova, Moscow)

First let us deal with the essence of the dispute. The transfer of enterprises to full economic accountability [khozraschet] entails the release of surplus workers and sometimes a considerable reduction in the management apparatus. For that reason there has been an increasing number of labor disputes on questions of redundancy recently. And ignorance of the procedure governing the examination of such disputes results in bureaucratic delay and complaints.

However, trade unions, which by their nature are protectors of working peoples' interests, can and must effectively prevent all attempts at **unlawful** [boldface as published] dismissal. After all, an administration has no right to dismiss a worker or employee (with the exception of some categories of workers) on its own initiative without the consent of the trade union committee of the enterprise, institution, or organization concerned. The trade union committee in its turn, and before giving its consent, must thoroughly investigate all the circumstances relevant to the termination of the contract of employment.

In particular, the mere fact of a change in the staff roster or the structure of an enterprise (shop, department, and so forth) is still not grounds for dismissal. It is necessary to ascertain whether a reduction in staff or the number of workers has actually taken place. Then it is necessary to check that the administration has considered the preferences of the worker recommended for redundancy which give him the right to remain in his old job (article 34 of the RSFSR Labor Laws Code and corresponding articles of the codes of other union republics).

The decision of the trade union committee—both in the case of agreeing to the redundancy and of refusing to grant the administration's request—cannot be revoked by a superior trade union organ or protested by the prosecutor. That is why the trade union gorkom to which Comrade Feoktistova appealed is not empowered to grant her request to rescind the trade union committee's decision. The gorkom simply has no such authority.

The legal inspectorate for labor cannot reinstate people to their jobs in such situations either, because it is not an organ for the examination of labor disputes. It can only issue an instruction to revoke a redundancy notice in one case: if the notice itself was issued in clear contravention of the law, in other words, when there is no dispute. In practice this happens quite rarely.

Only a rayon (city) people's court in session can settle a dispute concerning wrongful dismissal of a worker after it has examined all the materials of the case. The law prescribes a 1-month limit from the day that the redundancy notice was served if an action for reinstatement is to be brought: If no notice was served, the period is 1 month from the day that the labor record book was returned endorsed with a notification of redundancy or from the day that the worker refused to accept the notice or the endorsed labor book.

Does this mean that the court was justified in refusing Comrade Feoktistova's complaint? No. The court was obliged to accept it even though the plaintiff had exceeded the established time limit and was also obliged when examining the case to find out why that had happened. If the reason proved to be valid (and in this instance it may be considered as such) the court should have reinstated the period that had lapsed and then examined the essential facts of the complaint.

It is appropriate to recall at this point that the judge, in refusing to accept the complaint, had no right simply to return the documents submitted and give a verbal verdict. He is obliged to give a reasoned verdict in writing, indicating why the complaint has been rejected, and to notify the complainant of that reason. A private appeal against that verdict may then be submitted to a higher court.

Since none of this had been done, Comrade Feoktistova should again apply for the case to be referred to the people's court in the area where the enterprise in question is situated and at the same time should request the reinstatement of the lapsed 1-month period.

The trade union organs in their turn must give working people legal assistance in filing complaints on labor disputes, in gathering the necessary documents, and in supporting valid complaints in court, and, furthermore, can pay for the services of a lawyer if one is hired by the complainant.

Correction to Zaykov Remarks on INF Treaty

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Zaykov on INF Treaty", published in the 21 December Soviet DAILY REPORT, page 38, column one

paragraph one, penultimate line : ...and drawbacks but put forward feasible proposals...(supplying omitted word)

Economic

Abalkin on Need for New Perception of Centralism

PM211429 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 50, Dec 87 (Signed to Press 3 Dec 87) p 2

[Article by L. Abalkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of SciencesEconomics Institute, under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "The New Concept of Centralism"]

[Text] The Soviet economy is on the threshold of major changes. The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will come into force from the beginning of the new year. The overwhelming majority of basic links in industry, all transport, and many sectors of the agro-industrial complex will be transferred to conditions of full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing.

The transfer of enterprises and associations can produce high results only, of course, subject to a corresponding and sufficiently radical restructuring of the system and methods of centralized management. Essentially we are talking, as the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum said, about the introduction of a new concept of centralism. This concept is not the product of improvisation or strictly armchair deliberations. It was born from life and is based on profound political-economic generalizations and a critical interpretation of historical experience.

The Center's Functions [subhead]

The starting point of the new concept is the amplification and precise definition of the content and functions of centralized management. And this is possible only on the basis of a comprehensive and realistic analysis of the process of socialization, of the complex and dialectically contradictory structure of the economic system of socialism.

Today it is clear that the socialist socialization of production in no way leads to the creation of an economy with one single "common pot" or a "single large purse." Management built on such "theoretical" premises inevitably engenders dependence tendencies on the one hand and totally unrestricted and strictly administrative interference in economic life on the other hand. The consequences of such practice are well known.

The socialist socialization of production results in the formation of a complex and multitier structure of the economy whose basic links are production enterprises (associations). They play the role of socialist commodity producers, operating on the basis of full self-capitalization, economic accountability, and self-management. Only by creating a "most-favored-status regime" for their activity will it become possible to expect the radical enhancement of production efficiency, production's orientation toward the consumer, and the shaping of a genuinely proprietorial attitude toward labor and its results. To implement all this will mean to set in full motion the mighty potential of public ownership.

At the same time, the economic system of socialism is more than just the arithmetical sum of enterprises and other economic links. Emerging and strengthening in the process of the socialization of production, it possesses its own integrity. Similarly, the interest of the whole people can in no way be reduced to the sum total of collective and personal interests, or be exactly apportioned among those interests without a remainder.

The functions of centralized management must be defined with due consideration for the complex and contradictory unity between the economy's integrity and the relative separateness of its primary links. Strictly speaking, there are only two such functions. The first consists of the management of the national economy as a single whole. This involves those questions (and those questions alone!) which cannot be successfully resolved through autonomous actions [samodeystviye] by grassroots economic links. They are: the elaboration of economic growth strategy, the definition of goals and priorities in the national economy's development, and the implementation of a unified scientific and technical, structural, and investments policy.

The solution of these questions is, essentially and by its very nature, the prerogative of the center. And the center must, of course, have the necessary powers and financial resources and levers.

The second function of centralized management consists of creating conditions for efficient, independent, and responsible autonomous actions by the national economy's basic links. In terms of these conditions, decisive importance is attached to ensuring an overall global balance of the economy, eliminating the monopoly position of individual producers, and creating prerequisites for the broad development of effective economic competition. The exercise of this function is inseparably linked with the inclusion of the socialist market and its inherent methods in the management mechanism.

An analysis of the prevailing situation shows that both functions of centralized management are substantially deformed. Many decisions, including comprehensive programs for the development of individual sectors and regions, are made without working out questions of the development of the national economy as a whole; the solution of short-term tactical tasks prevails over strategic tasks. Restrictions on the initiative and independence of enterprises and associations are still maintained.

As a result of the prevailing system, centralized management is a serious obstacle in the way of economic and social progress and is the subject of fully justified and fair criticism. Management methods need fundamental renewal, and this must be achieved as a result of the radical reform of economic management which has been launched.

Transition to Economic Methods [subhead]

The question of methods is a question of how and with the help of what means we are to ensure the achievement of set goals and strategic objectives. One of the essential specific features of the new concept of centralism is linked with an understanding of the need to demolish obsolete methods and the ways to do this.

For several decades on end the management of the economy was performed by means of mainly administrative methods, which essentially took the form of edicts and orders. The ranks of the champions of these methods are significantly thinner today, and the majority of people realize that edict-order methods are hopelessly outdated and historically obsolete. It is, however, still not fully understood that such methods are justified and effective only in special and extreme conditions and that they are, in principle, alien to the economic system of socialism.

The socialist economy must be managed using its inherent economic methods. Their essence lies in management of interests and through interests. These methods alone can provide a basis for solving the main and most complex question of the theory and practice of management, namely the question of the most effective combination of plan leadership with the interests of the worker and the labor collective.

Under the edict-order methods, enterprises and their workers are the objects of management, while under economic methods they become the subjects of this process. This is why the transition to economic methods is inseparably linked with the democratization of management and the creation of an efficient mechanism for the functioning of public ownership and the utilization of its historical advantages.

This is not the first time that the question of economic methods has been raised. But today's perception of these methods is deeper, richer, and more meaningful than in the sixties. At that time there was talk about the introduction of a new system of planning and economic incentives. Under that formulation of the question, economic methods were perceived as a supplement to centralized planning, a kind of adjunct to that system rather than its essence. The Basic Provisions for the Radical Restructuring of Economic Management, elaborated and approved by the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, contain a fundamentally different interpretation of the problem. Economic methods—prices and credit, taxation and payment for resources, other financial levers, wholesale trade in the means of production—are perceived as the most important elements and components of the economy's centralized management.

A leading position in this system is occupied by economic normatives. They play simultaneously the role of planning instruments, making it possible to regulate the most important national economic proportions, and of the basis for the transition of enterprises to full economic accountability and self-financing. Economic normatives make it possible to efficiently coordinate the interests of society and the labor collective and to ensure their interest in high end results.

This is helped to the greatest possible extent by normatives, either uniform or built on uniform principles, for the distribution of profits and for the formation of the wages and economic incentives funds. Any individualization of normatives for enterprises or specific years contains the danger that they may degenerate into a variety of the former strictly administrative methods.

Of course, the transition to uniform normatives should not be perceived as a single act, totally unconnected with the overcoming of existing imbalances and the implementation of price reform. It is, however, necessary to perceive both the ultimate goal and the dangers created by the use of individual economic normatives.

The specific feature of "restructuring on the move" consists of the fact that many of the new methods will have to be superimposed on 12th 5-Year Plan targets which have already been approved and allotted for each year. A contradiction emerges between the need for uniform normatives and the impossibility of introducing them in the given conditions. This contradiction cannot be wished away—a way to resolve it must be sought.

One such way could be provided by the elaboration of a scale of normatives taking into account differences in starting conditions—like, for example, the level of equipment availability and profitability. In such a case, enterprises which have substantially different profitability levels will apply different normatives for budget deductions from profits, but enterprises with approximately the same level of profitability will apply uniform normatives. A similar method could be used to differentiate between other conditions of economic management. Much could be said in favor of building normative scales along the lines of progressive taxation.

Transition to economic methods of management does not mean refurbishment of the existing system but the assimilation of a qualitatively new model of economic mechanism. This involves much that will be unusual and nontraditional. Ahead lies a complex process of teaching the art of management by relying on the motive force of interests. This art cannot be learned just from books, but it will be difficult to do so without any good books.

The Philosophy of the State Order [subhead]

The fundamental characteristic of the new concept of centralism is linked with the abandonment of attempts to plan all and everything from the top. Socialist production must be oriented toward the consumer. The consumer's order is meant to become the starting point in the formation of production programs. Given such a procedure, it would be possible in principle to give up centralized approval for the volume and range of output being produced.

But, as the saying goes, no two clients are the same. There is one priority client—the state—that stands out among them all. Its special position is determined by the fact that it is the state which directly expresses universal needs. The elaboration of the modern philosophy of the state order is linked to the realization of this fact. These are not just newly invented words to describe the obsolete system of detailed specification of products range targets but the expression of a fundamentally different approach to the model of centralized management.

The state order is by nature limited, because it encompasses only the most important targets which have priority by reason of either strategic purpose or social importance. Any expansion of the range of targets inevitably leads to an erosion of this principle. The narrower the scope of priority targets the stricter the adherence to them, and vice versa.

In order to ensure that priority is something more than just an administrative formula or a slogan, and that it becomes economic reality, it must ensure advantage. The state order must become the most advantageous form of an enterprise's utilization of its production and labor potential. This advantage can be achieved by means of guaranteed sales, with the help of prices and tax benefits, and if necessary by means of preferential treatment in the acquisition of scarce resources. Any attempts to promote departmental interests by forcing enterprises, under the guise of the state order, to produce output on disadvantageous terms signify a rejection of the principles of the new economic management system.

The priority and advantage of the state order make it possible to place such orders on a competitive [konkursnaya] basis. Conditions are thus created for mobilizing the mighty force of economic competition [sorevnovaniye] in this important sphere of centralized management. It is the advantage of the state order and its placement on a competitive basis that transforms it into an economic method of management. If these features are absent, the state order degenerates into a conventional and ineffective system of strictly administrative influence on economic processes.

The role of control figures is also perceived in a fundamentally new fashion today. They are given to enterprises at the preplanning stage and are neither directives nor mandatory precepts. Attempts to force upon enterprises the targets set by control figures are a throwback to the old approaches, a blatant manifestation of nostalgia for administrative edicts.

It would be only natural to ask: So why do we need control figures if they are not mandatory? In the new concept of centralism, control figures play the role of guidelines used by planning organs to notify enterprises about upcoming changes or about any expansion or contraction of demand for the output of the relevant sectors and production units. They perform a particular and formerly unknown function, namely the information and guidance function of centralized management. Conditions are thus created to increase the flexibility of

management and its effective combination with the expansion of enterprise independence and initiative and the enhancement of their responsibility for the quality of their economic activity.

The restructuring of the entire model of the economy's centralized management must also affect the structure of management organs. By no means all questions here have been resolved yet. The theoretical explanation of approaches to the building of the structure of economic management organs becomes that much more topical.

Economic Management Organs [subhead]

As distinct from the state's political organs, economic management organs are a product of the socialization of production. The creation and reorganization of these organs by the state complicate the perception of this truth but do not in any way abrogate the objective logic governing the formation and development of the economic management structure.

The essence of this logic lies in the fact that the process of the socialization of production naturally gives rise to certain common functions. These functions are performed more effectively not by the enterprises themselves but by special organs set up for this purpose. The enterprises surrender part of their rights and powers to these organs expecting—not without reason—that they will be more successfully implemented. What takes place is a kind of "delegation of rights" from below to the upper echelons, rather than the opposite, as it is often held.

In this way, economic management organs play an auxiliary, service role as far as the economy's basic primary links are concerned. In the same way as the state with its organs plays a service role as far as the socialist society is concerned.

One of the contradictions of the socialization process consists of the fact that the management organs created in the course of its development have a tendency to become exclusive, to acquire their own interests, and to place themselves above those who gave them their powers. The gradual development of these tendencies, if it encounters no obstacles, inevitably leads to the bureaucratization of management and engenders the edict-order style. Powerful counterbalances are needed in order to prevent such phenomena—development of democratic principles in management, glasnost, and accountability [podkontrolnost] of economic management organs. It must be constantly borne in mind that enterprises do not exist for the ministries' sake, but that ministries exist for the enterprises' sake, for the creation of conditions for efficient economic management. This also applies to the other organs of economic management.

Bearing all this in mind, the restructuring of economic management will evidently progress along two avenues. First, along the path of voluntary creation by the enterprises themselves of organs subordinate to them (and to them alone!) to perform common functions—in the sphere of supply and marketing of output, the creation of production infrastructure facilities, and so on. Second, along the path of reorganizing the existing organs of economic management—their reduction and simplification, and the more efficient performance of the functions stemming from the process of socialization of production.

It can be assumed with sufficient certainty that, with the passage of time, the development of these processes will lead to the formation of a qualitatively different structure of economic management, fundamentally different from the present one. For the time being it is difficult to outline its actual shape. But it is important to sharply step up the political-economic study of the question and the analysis of the objective logic of shaping the organizational structures of economic management.

The practical implementation of the new concept of centralism demands the profound interpretation of its essence and the rejection of many dogmas inherited from the past. There is also a need for a substantial advance and a genuine breakthrough in the theory of socialist economic management. Only thus will it be possible to expect serious success in the economy and the radical enhancement of its efficiency.

Economist Advocates Factories Issue Shares

LD180447 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Economist Nikolay Shmelev has suggested that Soviet plants and factories should issue shares. This will make it possible for shareholders to exercise democratic control over production, he said in an interview for the weekly NEW TIMES.

In the twenties, in the framework of Lenin's New Economic Policy, a number of Soviet industrial facilities issued shares. That was when, Nikolay Shmelev said, we had a well balanced economy with greater individual incentives. Later, the principles of the New Economic Policy were neglected and replaced by the methods of command economy. Stringent centralization yielded good results at first, but soon it began to hinder economic progress. Moreover, it began to conflict with common sense. Currently, private bank accounts amount to an estimate of 200 billion rubles, almost $300 billion, largely because people are not always in a position to buy what they need.

The issuing of shares, Professor Shmelev said, will make it possible not only to put more money into circulation, but also to enhance the personal interest of workers in the profitability of their plants and factories. The economist refers to the experience of such countries as

Hungary, Yugoslavia, and China, where the issuing of shares has become a common practice. Prof Shmelev qualifies the law on individual enterprise adopted earlier this year and encouragement for the establishment of all kinds of cooperatives as a return to Lenin's model of economic management under socialism. Under the radical economic reform launched in the USSR, plants and factories now enjoy much greater rights in terms of manufacturing and selling their produce.

Baku on Pace of Reconstruction in Cooperatives

NC220954 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] At its regular meeting, the Council of the Azerbaijan SSR Consumers Societies Union discussed the question of reconstruction in the work carried out by the consumers cooperatives. Also discussed was the effort made to consolidate the organizational structure of these cooperatives. Abdullayev, the chairman of the Consumers Societies Union, read a report.

The participants in the meeting noted that the application of new economic measures in the consumers cooperative system has further facilitated the use of the existing resources to increase stocks and has improved the commodities used by the people. However, they also focused attention on the slow pace of reconstruction in all areas of the cooperative system. Many of obsolete forms and methods have not been abandoned.

The meeting identified the measures required for removing the deficiencies. The participants also discussed organizational and other problems.

Kasumova, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and Shevaginov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, participated in the work of the meeting.

Scientific

More on 'Soyuz TM-4' Ground, Space Activities

News Conference Held

LD211215 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Dec 87

[News conference held at Baykonur space center on 20 December—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] This is the usual kind of news conference. As always, the room is full of journalists. The three cosmonauts are separated from us by glass—the commander of the crew, Vladimir Georgiyevich Titov, who has already taken part in one flight; flight engineer Musakhi Romanovich Manarov, a MAI [Moscow Aviation Institute] graduate; and researcher-cosmonaut Anatoliy Semenovich Levchenko, a distinguished test pilot of the USSR. As always, the cosmonauts were presented by the head of the Gagarin Cosmonaut Training Center, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Shatalov. Cosmonaut Igor Petrovich Volk is present at the news conference. The first to speak is the commander of the Ocean-1 crew, Vladimir Titov.

[Titov] If we were to speak about the development of space technology in the Soviet Union, our program is a continuation of that general program. Therefore, the specific program for the third main expedition has been compiled in order to continue the research started before us and which will continue after us. Naturally, new things will appear in the process of implementing the program. It is possible that even new instruments, new equipment, and new experiments will appear that we do not even know about now. This in general has been discussed with specialists, and we hope that the experience accumulated in (?implementing) the prepared program will help us master new experiments that will be delivered aboard in close consultation with ground control and with specialists. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Handing things over on the ground is a usual thing. But I know that at many enterprises, in order to hand things over from one man to another, both of them work together for a month. You have much less time allocated to you. How is this space handover from one crew to another going to take place?

[Titov] Well, first, a very important thing on the station is to take an inventory. There is a great deal of equipment there, many modules, consumable materials, and similar goods. Naturally, in conditions of weightlesness, all this is located in various places, and you cannot forget even some minor detail. Consequently one crew has to hand over to the other, first of all, everything available in working order, and we have to memorize where all these things are. Apart from that, the experience of controlling the system, which the crew gathers in orbit, also has to be passed onto the new crew as much as possible, because experiments will start practically at once. Work on servicing the system will start right away, and you cannot permit mistakes in that. Consequently, we attach much importance to passing on experience. Naturally, since our handover period is short, we have selected the main aspects, the most difficult jobs on which both the safety of the complex and its future operation depend, so that we make no errors at the key moments.

[Correspondent] I have a question for you, Vladimir Aleksandrovich. What is the purpose of increasing the duration of space flights?

[Shatalov] If we can more or less say that 237 days is nothing to fear, when it comes to 326, we shall still have to see after the crew returns to earth. But in both cases we know that the crew cannot work with sufficient efficiency during their first hours, or perhaps even the first day or several days, after return to earth. This is important also in flying to Mars, in landing on Mars, and in working on the surface of Mars, and it will be even more important on returning to earth: how to get used to

earth's gravity gradually, softly. It is not ruled out that we might indeed make use of some large orbital systems later on as interim bases, for the launching, for preparation of the launch, and for assembly of these ships. That is probably how it will be; they will not be launched straight from earth. The same thing will occur especially on return, and it is not ruled out that future bases might be needed on the moon. There perhaps, the crew would have to spend some time, perhaps a month, in order to get used to, let us say, one-sixth of earth's gravity. All in all, today all this is no longer some remote science fiction. We are now in the age of progress, when less and less time elapses between the idea and its fulfillment. I think the things we are discussing today are not just dreams or fiction but real preparation for future work, and future work has to be planned for many decades, just as we plan our life on earth. So everything cannot be solved in a day, but we have to prepare now for this important, large-scale work. We have to gain this experience now. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Igor Petrovich, as a flyer would you like to change anything in space systems?

[Volk] Absolutely. As the ideology of these ships that we fly was laid down a long time ago, many things were thought of in a different way. Naturally, much in this ship could be improved for the men, for their functioning, so that they are more comfortable.

[Correspondent] Are you able to take along your personal things? What do you take with you aboard the station?

[Unidentified cosmonaut] Well, in the main, these are either some sort of photographs, first and foremost of the family, some treasured photographs. [passage omitted]

More on News Conference

LD201910 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast—K. Grudkin report]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] A pre-launch press conference of cosmonauts was held in Baykonur today.

[Grudkin]: The crew, as confirmed by the state commission, which will occupy the cabin of the vessel "Soyuz-TM4" on 21 December, was presented to journalists: the commander, Vladimir Titov; the flight engineer, Musakhi Manarov; and the researcher-cosmonaut, Anatoliy Levchenko. Vladimir Aleksandrovich Shatalov, head of the Cosmonaut Training Center reported on the readiness of the whole complex for the start. The journalists' first question was on the flight program. [passage omitted]

The participation of test pilot Anatoliy Levchenko in the flight aroused particular interest among the journalists.

[Shatalov] Why is it necessary to have a test pilot on the crew? Well, it is necessary, perhaps, because of future space systems being created and developed, which cannot be created every day, without getting certain experience, certain kinds of careful experiments that have been carried out, including reusable systems—the very technology of piloting such a reusable system. How is it? Will it be the same as the technology of piloting present-day vessels, or should it differ from them in some way? Probably it should differ because it has to land like an aircraft at an airfield. So, training should also be of a certain, special kind.

[Grudkin] The topic of future cosmonautics—flight to other worlds: Man has to be prepared for a great deal, and, above all, for staying in space for extended periods.

[Shatalov] Extended flights are not aims in themselves. As for the fact that people often ask whether this extended period is necessary, well, it is necessary from the point of view of the same experiment alongside those hundreds of complex and even more complex experiments that will now be conducted by this crew in an extended flight, and not more. Of course, this is not an aim in itself, but this is additional data necessary for planning our future work say, with the involvement, perhaps, of international expeditions or our own expeditions.

[Titov] Well, without such a learning process, in general we will not get anywhere. It simply must be understood that without this, we will not get anywhere. We have to test and research everything and, naturally, conduct an analysis. [passage omitted]

Moscow TV Reports Launch

LD211926 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 21 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast special correspondent S. Slipchenko report from Baykonur on launch of "Soyuz TM-4"]

[Text] [Slipchenko] One could say that this launch completes the successful space year of 1987. The "Soyuz TM-4" spacecraft is now about to be launched. The crew about to be blasted off will replace the crew now on the "Mir" station. Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov will usher in the new year back on earth.

Late yesterday evening, biologists showed us this garden [ogorod], which left for orbit yesterday. [video shows aquarium with fish, and plants connected to equipment] The experiments were prepared by the Institute of Medical and Biological Problems, the Institute of General Genetics, and other organizations of the Academy of Sciences.

Suiting-up and airtightness checks are the first two most important operations before the cosmonauts board the carrier-rocket. Specialists ensured the fit carefully, and

the forty minutes set aside for this operation were reduced to a minimum, so that there was some time left to have a chat with friends and bid them farewell.

This path is no longer than 50 meters, but the steps taken along it are especially crucial, for they are the final steps on earth, before the launch. [video shows cosmonauts walking along a path]

The cosmonauts today delivered their report to Chairman of the State Commission Kerim Aliyevich Kerimov:

[Cosmonaut Petrov]: Comrade Chairman of the State Commission. The crew of the "Soyuz TM-4" spacecraft is ready for the flight. Crew Commander Colonel Petrov.

[Kerimov] I wish you a successful completion of the flight program and safe return to your home, the earth.

[Petrov] Thank you.

[Kerimov] Take your seats in the vehicle.

[Petrov] Thank you. [video shows cosmonaut delivering report, Kerimov replying, crew boarding bus and waving from inside, interior shot of crew in bus, two buses preceded by car with flashing lights disappearing into fog]

[Slipchenko] Reporters' questions detained the cosmonauts at the bus boarding point for a minute or so, but the journalists will be unable to travel any further. By the assembly and testing building, one could still see the bus go and disappear into the fog, but here at the launch pad, by the rocket, our cameras encountered a total shroud of fog. This is how the bus was visible at the approach section. [video shows cosmonauts alighting from bus and going up launch pad steps] Only 15 minutes before the launch the fog, the dense fog, began to disperse, and the rocket's silhouette became discernible. It is usual for us to see how it is steaming; here the liquid oxygen vapors became mixed with the fog.

They tell me that the steps Yuriy Alekseyevich Gagarin took to get to the carrier rocket were much higher. Everything has now changed here. The complex changes with each passing year, undergoing further improvements.

Seven minutes before launch there should be the command: Commence countdown [Klyuch na start]. What you are watching now is the bunker, central control post. The key to start position means the key that sets the systems going is put into its socket. The command: Key to the venting position [Klyuch na drenazh] has just been heard. You can see that the key has been turned: Control of the carrier rocket is automatic from now on.

[Unidentified voice] Launch. [words indistinct]

[Slipchenko over sound of rocket engine] You can now hear the noise.

[Unidentified voice] Ignition: preliminary, intermediate, main, lift-off. Combustion is normal.

[Second unidentified voice] This is a bit of rocking [Eto nebolshaya raskachka]. [video shows ignition and lift off; camera cuts to control room, showing control panels; camera cuts to view of rocket disappearing into sky]

Craft Moves to Higher Orbit

LD220402 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Here is a report from the control center: The flight of the "Mir" manned complex and the "Soyuz TM-4," which was launched yesterday, continues. Yuriy Romanenko is in his 320th day in weightlessness and Aleksandr Aleksandrov has been working for 22 weeks in orbit. Today our space veterans will be preparing the station to receive the new crew. The day's schedule also includes astrophysics experiments. Several sessions with the roentgen orbital observatory are also planned.

The crew of the "Soyuz TM-4" craft are preparing to rendezvous with the "Mir" orbital complex. Several maneuvers have been made, as a result of which the craft has moved to a higher orbit. According to the cosmonauts' reports, the flight of the "Soyuz TM-4" is going according to the planned schedule.

Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov, and Anatoliy Levchenko are in good health and feel fine.

Flight 'Proceeding Normally'

LD221248 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 22 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS—The spaceship "Soyuz TM-4" manned by Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov and Anatoliy Levchenko is continuing in flight.

In accordance with the pre-set program, the crew carried out routine operations for checking on the on-board systems of the spaceship and the air-tightness of its compartments. After the first two-impulse manoeuvre of initial rendezvous with the research complex "Mir", the orbital parameters of the spaceship "Soyuz TM-4" are as follows: Maximum distance from the earth surface—298 kilometres minimum distance—260 kilometres period of revolution—89.9 minutes inclination of the orbit—51.6 degrees.

Yuriy Romanenko has been working in near-earth orbit for the 320th day today, while Aleksandr Aleksandrov is completing his 22nd week in outer space. Today they are engaged in preparations for a meeting with cosmonauts Titov, Manarov and Levchenko on board the manned complex.

According to reports from orbit and data of telemetric information, the flights of the orbital complex "Mir" and spaceship "Soyuz TM-4" are proceeding normally.

Cosmonaut Titov's Near Misses Reported

PM221045 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Report by Colonel M. Rebrov: "Emergency Situation"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] ...The "Soyuz T-8" spacecraft took off on 20 April 1983 at 1711 hours. At the time, I called my KRASNAYA ZVEZDA sketch of the crew "'Oceans" Moment of Truth." I did not use these words for mere embellishment. These three men, whose call sign was "Ocean," were very anxious to work out their program together. Gennadiy Strekalov and Sasha Serebrov were taking off for the second time that April. Vladimir Titov was on his first rendezvous with space. Their "special assignment," "Salyut-7," "Kosmos-1443," awaited them in orbit.

It awaited them.... The first unpleasant incident was when, after going into orbit, the control display of the "Igla" docking system antenna failed to light up on the spacecraft instrument panel. That meant that the antenna had failed to take up its operating position. At the time it was impossible to say what would happen after that. The encounter with the "Salyut-7" was to take place 24 hours later, or 24 and 1/2 hours later, to be more precise.

The night passed by. The "Oceans" had completed the final correction to the approach route toward the end of the first 24 hours. All subsequent operations were performed according to standard procedure, and now the spacecraft and the station were separated by just slightly more than 10 km. Intricate work was performed in the complex interaction between radio engineering, the spacecraft's electronic brain, and the actions of the crew itself. Intricate because one imprecise movement, one malfunction, one incorrect decision could...

I shall not describe in detail the gist of what happened. An emergency situation took shape: The spacecraft and the station were approaching each other, yet the crew was not receiving instrument readings for distance and speed. According to instructions, the docking is cancelled when equipment is defective in this way. But the crew begged (it is hard to choose any other word) for permission to try. The control center, having assessed the situation, agreed. The ballisticians changed the pattern of maneuvers and made recommendations.

The attempt involved not only experimentation but also responsibility. They "worked" through an optical sight. Turns, engine startings, the definition of the necessary parameters for the station's "growth" on the grid [sentence as published without verb].

The "Salyut-7" was glittering in the sun and blinding their vision.... Then the spacecaft and station entered the shadow of earth. In the darkness it was very difficult to assess distance and speed visually. The slightest error was fraught with the danger of a collision. The commander realized what he was risking, but he had no other way out. Only this risky but deliberate attempt could save the program.

The tension mounted. The "Soyuz" and the "Salyut" were separated by a few meters when Vladimir realized that a collision was inevitable. Having assessed the situation, he used a sharp maneuver to draw the spacecraft down, beneath the station. Center did not allow a second attempt.

On 22 April "Zarya" gave the order and computation data for the landing. At 1728 hours 42 seconds, the "Soyuz T-8" reentry vehicle landed softly on earth.

The dispassionate reports recorded that this flight lasted 48 hours, 17 minutes, and 42 seconds. But what hours and seconds they were!

That same year, in the fall, Vladimir Titov returned to Baykonur to take the commander's seat in the next spacecraft. Nothing on that day presaged trouble. The hot September sun had begun, as though reluctantly, its customary journey toward the horizon. The bus windows glittered in the rays of the sunset. The crew was going to the launchpad....

What happened that night might seem implausible. But it is all absolutely true. An emergency arose in the seconds before the launch. A fire on the launch vehicle, the emergency rescue system put into operation...

Manned space flights were over 25 years old, and many dozens of launches had been accomplished in the past. Over 200 earth dwellers had already been in space orbits, but history had never before known such tests for equipment and for people's will and nerves.

What happened then?

What happened then was something that had never happened either there on the ship as it bore down menacingly on the station, nor at the top of the launch vehicle as it burned, nor in the reentry vehicle abruptly ejected and parachuted to the ground.... There was fear. But not for his own life. Fear for his future in cosmonautics.

Sometimes it seemed to him that he was whiling away time in total and absolute isolation, needed by no one and of interest to no one. Yet only recently everything had been quite different. There had been hope. But now... People began to speak of the "Titov syndrome,"

to feel sorry for the "failure," and to hint at "psychological barriers." There was delay in finding a standby operator. Why? What had really happened? He sought answers to these questions, and not only for himself.

Why did a man need these hard ordeals attended by risk? Why is a particular action carried out? If he were suddenly to renounce flying, to renounce risk, to renounce the difficulties and ordeals, even the tedious stages of training—everything after that would be merely existing. Should he rest pn his laurels for that first flight, which gave him the right to call himself a pilot-cosmonaut and look for a quieter, more comfortable place? What, it seemed, was the point of any lofty concepts to a man compared to the possibility of an "easy life...?"

Could he have thought that way? I do not know. But I am firmly convinced that he did not think that way. He had proved his right to a new flight, proved it not by words but by deeds. He was terribly tired, and there was no end to that tense tiredness. The crucial stage of training coincided with examinations at the academy. He succeeded in both fields. When day ceased to be day, he crossed the threshold of his home.

Home is the only place where we are completely accepted for what we are, and we are answerable to it for every outburst of emotion. He loves his home and his children very much, likes busying himself about the house, knows how to do everything, and does it with his own hands. His wife Sasha is a good housewife, caring and kind.... How much help she gave him at the moment of frightening crisis, of powerlessness and resentment at the time lost....

There, in orbit, Titov would like to stop time. Here on earth he is hurrying it along. It is possible to hurry time along. It means coming closer to your set goal, to your cherished dream.

A few days ago at Zvezdnyy Gorodok, A. Leonov, USSR pilot-cosmonaut major general of aviation, told me: "Volodya is ready for flights of any complexity. And I can see no better crew for this program...." [passage omitted]

Data Cited From 'Astron' Observatory

LD270222 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Excerpts] The unmanned orbital observatory "Astron" was launched 5 years ago for an active service span of about 1 year. The observatory has however outlived its lifespan by a very large margin and is still functioning normally, returning a wealth of data to earth. [passage omitted

During a 3-hour communication session, mission control received data about an average 80,000 measurements. A special software package was developed to be able to process such a massive flow of data. "Astron" returned data about the concentrations of heavy elements in the atmospheres of stars and the behavior of unstable stars. It acquried the images of over 100 stars, more than 30 galaxies, dozens of nebulas, and several comets. [passage omitted]

"Astron" was reprogrammed and reoriented to investigate the supernova. For 4 days running, which is the observatory's orbital period, mission control received data about the evolution of the supernova, which developed an expanding, very bright shell after the flare. That show is now subsiding and scientists cannot wait to find out what is inside; there may be a neutron star or a pulsar.

At the moment, a replacement is being readied for "Astron." It will have a larger telescope and a more advanced onboard computer.

Warsaw Intercosmos 20th Anniversary Meeting

TA190920 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 23 Nov 87

[Text] A meeting held in Warsaw to mark the 20th anniversary of the Intercosmos Program of the socialist countries has ended. The Moscow Radio correspondent in Warsaw reports: As most of the scientists, engineers, and cosmonauts who participated in the Warsaw meeting pointed out, space research creates great opportunities to unfold the world's secrets and improve conditions of living in [word indistinct].

Already, space research has provided humanity with appreciable results, such as contributing to improvement of the linkage system, exploration of our planet's natural resources, rescuing of accident victims in the oceans or deserts, and to other matters.

To conduct research in space, cooperation among various countries is necessary. If trust among countries and peoples does not exist to a great degree, there is no possibility of cooperation among them. Accordingly, the conquest of space will also contribute to a certain degree to humanity.

Besides being a source of benefit for humanity, space can also become a death threat. This last aspect of the subject was also discussed during the Warsaw meeting. The beginning of the arms race in space will depend on the billions of dollars to be spent by the United States for the Star Wars program. With the implementation of this program, which has already cost a lot of money, humanity will become the hostage of the destructive tools it has created.

All that will be left for humanity will be to hope that this equipment, which has the capability to create and destroy all, will not go out of order or malfunction. Undoubtedly, this is a most pessimistic perspective.

During the meeting held in Warsaw, a program of cooperation for space research intended for peaceful purposes was determined. It was pointed out during this meeting that implementing this plan, which will be concluded by the year 2005 and which is aimed at peaceful goals, is compatible with the nature of the socialist community.

Progress should not be realized at the expense of threatening the existence of human kind but should serve its interests.

Nuclear Power Engineering Seminar Conducted

LD200633 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 19 Dec 87

[Text] Krasnodar, 29 December (TASS)—The second international seminar on nuclear power engineering ended today in the Soviet Black Sea resort of Sochi. Taking part in it were delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, the Republic of Cuba, Poland, SRV, and the Soviet Union. Problems involving effects of nuclear power stations on the environment were discussed. Scientists' attention was drawn to the rapid rise in construction of nuclear power stations.

Special attention was paid to questions of making rational use of natural resources on the sites of nuclear power engineering enterprises and to developing ecological methods of control. New methods of mathematical analysis were proposed. The need to set up a single center for processing material and to produce equipment, instruments, and reagents for it jointly was stressed.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.